DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 697 CE 044 787

TITLE	National Forum on Building Relationships for Educational Excellence in Corrections Proceedings (Crystal City, Virginia, October 22-23, 1984).
INSTITUTION	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Oct 84
NOTE	192p.; Assistance provided by the Correctional Education Association.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Adult Literacy; *Correctional Education; Correctional Institutions; Criminals; *Educational Cooperation; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Needs; Literacy Education; Postsecondary Education; *Prisoners; Professional Associations; Program Improvement; Rehabilitation Programs; Vocational Rehabilitation

ABSTRACT

This document contains the proceedings of an annual conference of corrections officials who gathered in order to build relationships for improving correctional education. Papers in the document include the following: (1) opening general session remarks and conference goals by John K. Wu, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, and Duane Nielsen, Deputy Director, Division of Innovation and Development, U.S. Department of Education; (2) panel summaries--"Department of Education Resources and Practices in Correctional Education" moderated by Allen Wilson, Acting Deputy Director, National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education; "Correctional Education Practices and Program Issues," moderated by Dianne Carter, Corrections Education Program Specialist, U.S. Department of Education; and "The Role of Professional Organizations in Support of Correctional Education: Current Practices and Visions for the Future," moderated by Osa Coffey, Executive Director, Correctional Education Association; (3) an address by Robert M. Worthington, Assistant Secretary, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, "Building Partnerships for Educational Excellence in Corrections"; (4) summaries of working sessions; (5) working session forms and documents; (6) conference evaluation; (7) list of participants; and (8) state directors' reports. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272697

PROCEEDINGS
of the

National Forum on Building Relationships for Educational Excellence in Corrections

October
1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

E044787

SPONSORED BY:

THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION
THE CORRECTIONS EDUCATION PROGRAM

AND ASSISTED BY

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

MEMORANDUM

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

TO : Correctional Education Forum
Participants and State Directors
of Correctional Education

DATE: February 19, 1985

FROM : Dr. Dianne Carter Dianne Carter
Corrections Education Program Specialists
Corrections Education Program

SUBJECT: Proceedings of the Corrections Education Forum, 1984

Enclosed is your copy of the Proceedings from the Corrections Education Forum held in Crystal City, Virginia on October 22-23, 1984.

Significant information was generated from the Forum that is of value in providing direction for all levels of correctional education operation. The Proceedings include a brief Abstract of the Forum activities as well as detailed reports of each activity and their products. Also included are separate written reports submitted by each state director of correctional education in attendance.

A profile of the recommendations made for a national conference on correctional education is also included. It is the intent of the Department of Education to host a national conference in October 1985. Further information relevant to this conference will be made available at a later date.

The Corrections Education Program Staff hope that you find this document of value. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Enclosure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT 1

Dr. Dianne Carter
Corrections Program Specialist
Corrections Education Program
U.S. Department of Education

AGENDA 5

I. OPENING GENERAL SESSIONS 10

A. "Welcome" John K. Wu
Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Office of Vocational and Adult Education .. 11

B. "Conference Goals" Dr. Duane Nielsen
Deputy Director, Division of Innovation
and Development 12

C. "Opening Remarks" John K. Wu
Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Office of Vocational and Adult Education .. 13

II. PANEL SUMMARIES 14

A. "Department of Education Resources
and Practices in Correctional
Education" 15

Moderator: Dr. Allen Wilson
Acting Deputy Director,
National Institute of Education
U.S. Department of Education

B. "Correctional Education Practices
and Program Issues" 17

Moderator: Dr. Dianne Carter
Corrections Education Program
Specialist
U.S. Department of Education

C. "The Role of Professional Organizations in
Support of Correctional Education:
Current Practices and Visions for the
Future" 18

Moderator: Dr. Osa Coffey
Executive Director
Correctional Education
Association

III. LUNCHEON ADDRESS 20

"Building Partnerships for Educational Excellence in Corrections" 21

Dr. Robert M. Worthington
Assistant Secretary,
Office of Vocational and Adult Education

(Mr. Norman Carlson's Speech entitled "Correctional Education in the 80's" was unavilable)

IV. CLOSING SUMMARIES OF WORKING SESSIONS 31

V. WORKING SESSION FORMS 36

VI. WORKING SESSION DOCUMENTS 47

Red Group 48

Facilitator: Becky Smith
Recorders: Osa Coffey
Jim Parker

Blue Group 56

Facilitator: T.A. Ryan
Recorder: Steve Swisher

Black Group 65

Facilitator: John Linton
Recorder: Bill Wienke

Pink Group 72

Facilitator: Randy Shipe
Recorder: John Platt

VII. CONFERENCE EVALUATION 76

Analysis of Questionnaires Report

VIII. FORUM PARTICIPANTS

A. Department of Education Participants 93

B. State Representatives
Professional Organizations
Private Sector 96

IX. APPENDICES 104

State Directors' Reports

ABSTRACT

Corrections Education Forum
Crystal City, Virginia
October 22-23, 1984

Dr. Dianne Carter
Correctional Education Program Specialist
Corrections Education Program
U.S. Department of Education

On October 22-23, 1984 the Department of Education hosted a Corrections Education Forum in Crystal City, Virginia. The goals of this Forum were to provide an opportunity for the corrections field, state education representatives, professional organization representatives, and Department of Education personnel to exchange information and discuss issues and concerns related to the delivery of educational services to offenders and to assist in making recommendations for a National Conference on Correctional Education to be held in 1985. The Forum was designed as a working conference to generate identification of correctional education needs, issues, possible solutions, and planning for the national conference. To accomplish this task attendance at the Forum was limited. However, to ensure representation of the diversity of concerns participating states were selected based on considerations of geographic representation, size of prison population, state management structure of programs, and longevity of the state administrators in their roles. Eight states were invited, including Alabama, Connecticut, Georgia, Michigan, New York, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. State delegates included directors of correctional education, vocational, adult, Chapter I, Chapter II, bilingual, special education, and postsecondary. Each of the offices in the Department of Education were represented, as were corrections related professional organizations, other federal agencies, and the private sector. Professional organizations that were represented were the Correctional Education Association, American Association of Adult and Continuing Education, American Correctional Association, American Vocational Association, National Sheriffs Association, and the National Association of Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel.

Mr. John K. Wu, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Vocational and Adult Education welcomed the group at the opening session on the first day. Following his address Dr. Duane Nielsen, Deputy Director for the Division of Innovation and Development, presented the Forum goals and objectives.

The opening session was followed with a panel presentation by the Assistant Secretaries, or their designees, in the Department of Education. They addressed the topic of "Department of Education Resources and Practices in Correctional Education." This particular session was well received by the Forum participants and specific requests were made that another opportunity be planned for a similar exchange that would include more time for dialogue.

The Assistant Secretaries have been asked to make a similar presentation for all of the state directors of correctional education at their meeting on July 14, 1985 held in conjunction with the national CEA conference.

At the Forum luncheon on the first day, two speakers addressed the group. Dr. Robert M. Worthington, Assistant Secretary, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, discussed "Building Partnerships for Educational Excellence in Corrections." Mr. Norman Carlson, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, spoke on "Correctional Education in the 80's."

The afternoon of the first day included two (2) additional panel presentations. Representatives from the corrections field addressed "Correctional Education Practices and Program Issues." Representatives from the professional organizations, on the second afternoon panel, focused on "The Role of Professional Organizations in Support of Correctional Education: Current Practices and Visions for the Future."

The second day of the Forum was devoted to small group working sessions. Participants were asked to identify client characteristics, impediments to the provision and delivery of services, modifications or innovations for removal of the impediments, and recommendations for a national conference on correctional education to be held in 1985. Procedures for the working groups included discussion, submittal of written recommendations and products, and large group reporting of the findings at the conclusion of the Forum.

Common client characteristics identified in the working sessions included significant deficits in education, employability, social, and economic levels. Students were identified as functioning far below their estimated potential and alienated from school programs. High proportions of the population reportedly evidence educational and emotional disabilities. Many have been substance abusers and are frequently repeat offenders. These offenders exhibit low self-esteem and have poor motivation. In addition, they seem unable to establish realistic goals and plan for their futures.

Immature moral development and poor health care are also associated with this population. Offenders are also disproportionately represented by minority males dwelling in urban centers.

The working groups next addressed impediments to the provision and delivery of educational services in corrections. Frequently cited, by the participants, was the public's adverse attitude toward the provision of services for inmates which results in limited resources. Most of the impediments could be categorized as either state or federal issues and in some cases mutual concerns. State related concerns included such issues as inadequate facilities, frequent movement of inmates negatively impacting the educational programs of inmates, out-of-date equipment and materials, lack of qualified staff, and lack of mission and coordination within the system.

Federal issues were related to a lack of standards, lack of a master plan, and inadequate coordination and involvement of the corrections field in major decisions and projects. The federal government was also cited for insensitivity to the correctional environment and needs in relation to legislation and associated development of regulations. Common examples referred to were the Chapter I regulations and those dealing with P.L. 94-142, handicapped legislation. Another concern related to legislation addressed the permissive language that allows states to include or exclude correctional institutions in resource distribution. When this language is permissive the correctional programs are frequently excluded and the educational programs suffer.

Issues that were common at all levels included professional isolation and lack of networking. Unclear purposes, goals, and commitment from governing agencies were also cited, as were a lacks in strategic coordination, involvement, and communication. Lack of research was also frequently identified as a deficit. Cooperation within and among systems was another issue.

Following the identification of impediments the working groups recommended modifications and innovations for the removal of the impediments to the provision and delivery of educational services. These recommendations focused on development of linkages and coordination within and among systems. Formal agreements among agencies were identified as valuable. Development and implementation of national and state standards and a master plan were seen as imperatives. Systems for identification and communication of resources were also seen as needed. Strategies that would allow for input into legislation and regulations were identified as significant areas of concerns. In general, most of the recommendations focused around methods that would allow correctional education programs to voice their needs and to be heard, as equals, among other educational programs.

Listing of the impediments and specific recommended solutions were extensive; therefore they were reduced into categories for this report. The interested reader is referred to the total text of the Proceedings of the Corrections Education Forum, 1984 for specifics. This document is available from the Corrections Education Program, U.S. Department of Education.

The second major goal of the working groups was to make recommendations for a National Conference on Correctional Education to be hosted by the U.S. Department of Education. Most of the Forum participants recommended an October 1985 date with a theme based on building partnerships and relationships for excellence in correctional education. There was diversity among the recommendations of where the conference should be held. However, due to the major recommendations to include members of Congress, Chief Justice Warren Burger, Department of Education personnel, and other federal agencies, a Washington, D.C. site is mandated for logistical reasons.

In general, most participants suggested major sessions with keynote speakers plus smaller sessions on specific topics. Most recommendations included a blend of keynote addresses, small group sessions, workshop sessions, special interest strands and an opportunity for exhibits. It was stressed that this conference should not be in competition with conferences sponsored by professional organizations in terms of similar format. It was recommended that the heaviest emphasis should be on workshops describing how to access resources and presentations from the various offices and agencies relevant to their resources and programs. Interaction should be promoted rather than lecturing, and "show and tell" of model programs should be minimized.

Anticipated products from this conference should include:

1. Development of a national awareness of correctional education and society's interests in strengthening correctional education.

2. Increased cooperation and coordination among the correctional education field, federal agencies, the private sector, Congress, and the public in addressing offender needs.

3. Creation of legislative, Federal/State/Local, support for correctional education.

4. Promotion of a professional identity for correctional educators.

5. Increased knowledge of the needs and the resources for correctional education.

6. Promotion of networking and development of new resources for correctional education.

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM

"BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE IN CORRECTIONS"

Howard Johnson's Motor Lodge
Arlington (Crystal City), Virginia
October 21-23, 1984

CONFERENCE AGENDA

Sunday, October 21, 1984	
6:00 - 8:00 p.m.	Registration and Hospitality Suite
Monday, October 22, 1984	
8:00 - 9:30 a.m.	Registration/Coffee
9:00 - 10:00	**INTRODUCTION:** Bernard B. O'Hayre Correction Education Program **WELCOME:** John K. Wu Deputy Assistant Secretary, OVAE
10:00 - 10:15	**CONFERENCE GOALS** Duane Nielsen Deputy Director Division of Innovation and Development
10:15 - 10:30	Break
10:30 - 11:45	Department of Education Resources and Practices in Correctional Education Moderator: Allen Wilson Acting Deputy Director National Institute of Education U.S. Department of Education

Panelist : Benjamin Alexander
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Student Financial Assistance Programs
Office of Postsecondary Education
U.S. Department of Education

Rudy Cordova
Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs
U.S. Department of Education

Wendy Cullar
Director, Special Education Programs
Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Service
U.S. Department of Education

Fred Decker
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education

Cecillia Frantz
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
U.S. Department of Education

Rudy Munis
Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs
U.S. Department of Education

Diane Vines
Director, Adult Literacy Initiative
U.S. Department of Education

11:45 - 1:30 p.m. Luncheon

Introduction:

Dianne Carter
Corrections Education Program

Speaker: Robert M. Worthington
Assistant Secretary, OVAE

Address: Building Partnerships For Educational Excellence in Corrections

Introduction:

Bernard O'Hayre
Corrections Education Program

Speaker: Norman Carlson
Director
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D.C.

Address: Correctional Education in the 80's

1:30 - 3:00 Correctional Education Practices and Program Issues

Moderator: Dianne Carter
Corrections Program
U.S. Department of Education

Panelists: David Carnahan
Educational Administrator
Department of Corrections
State of Washington

Robert Hable
Director of Correctional Education
Division of Corrections
State of Wisconsin

Petrita Hernandez-Rojas
Director of Education
Department of Correctional Services
State of New York

Hy Steinberg
Director, Education Services
Texas Youth Council
State of Texas

Raymond Vitelli
Director of Education
Correction School District
State of Connecticut

3:15 - 4:30 The Role of Professional Organizations in Support of Correctional Education: Current Practices and Visions for the Future

Moderator: Osa D. Coffey
Executive Director
Correctional Education Association

Panelists: Gary Eyre
Executive Director
American Association of Adult and Continuing Education

Dick Ford
Director, Jail Operations
National Sheriff's Association

Al Lynch
President
National Association of Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel

Charlotte Nesbitt
Director
American Correctional Association

Ted Shannon
American Vocational Association

Tuesday, October 23, 1984

8:30 - 8:45 a.m.	Opening Remarks John K. Wu Deputy Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education U.S. Department of Education
8:45 - 9:00	Move to small groups
9:00 - 10:15	Special Needs and Issues in Correctional Education (Work Session)
10:15 - 10:30	Break
10:30 - 11:45	Special Needs and Issues in Correctional Education (Continued)
11:45 - 1:00	Buffet Luncheon

1:00 - 3:15	General Educational Issues in Correctional Education (Work Session)
3:15 - 3:45	Break (optional time for State groups to meet)
3:45 - 4:30	Forum Summaries and Recommendations
4:30 - 4:45	Closing Remarks and Future Directions Timothy D. Halnon Corrections Program U.S. Department of Education

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM

SUMMARY

OF THE

OPENING GENERAL SESSION

Welcome Address: John K. Wu
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
U.S. Department of Education

October 22, 1984

Mr. John K. Wu welcomed the Forum participants on behalf of Secretary Bell and Assistant Secretary Robert M. Worthington. He shared with the group the variety of agencies, states, organizations, and offices represented. Eight states were invited to send representatives including state directors of correctional education, vocational education, adult, special education, Chapter I, Chapter II, and Bilingual Education. The states invited included Alabama, Connecticut, Georgia, Michigan, New York, Texas, Washington and Wisconsin. These states represent each geographic region in the U.S., small and large prison programs, and various state management structures. They were specifically selected to represent the concerns and issues unique to their characteristics. Each of the offices in the Department of Education were represented in attendance by their personnel as were professional organizations concerned with correctional education issues.

Mr. Wu stressed the importance of the tasks for the next two (2) days and the responsibility borne by all "to offenders, to our agencies and to the other states we represent in our endeavors."

Conference Goals: Dr. Duane M. Nielsen
Deputy Director
Division of Innovation and Development
U.S. Department of Education

October 22, 1984

Dr. Duane Nielsen reviewed the goals and objectives of the Correctional Education Forum with the participants. They were stated as follows:

FORUM GOALS

- To provide Forum participants with the opportunity to learn and exchange information relevant to Correctional Education that will promote and support education and training resources and opportunities for offenders.

- To provide Forum participants with the opportunity to submit recommendations and to assist in the planning for a National Conference on Correctional Education in 1985.

FORUM OBJECTIVES

- Provide the members of the Intra-Departmental Coordinating Committee with the opportunity to learn from the Correctional Field the resources and educational issues and concerns in the provision of education services for offenders.

- Provide the offices within the Department of Education the opportunity to share with the Corrections Field available resources, access procedures and existing services in correctional education.

- Identify and report the findings of the Forum and utilize the results in establishing future directions in federal assistance in the provision of educational resources for offenders.

- Involve the Forum participants in activities to assist in the planning of a National Correctional Education Conference. (1985)

Opening Remarks: John K. Wu
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
U.S. Department of Education

October 23, 1985

Mr. Wu welcomed the participants to the second day of the Forum. He reviewed the events of the previous day and identified the tasks for the second day. "Today's activities bring life to our theme, (Building Relationships for Educational Excellence in Corrections) for we will be working together and building relationships that will result in educational excellence in corrections. The recommendations that you make today will serve as a guide for future efforts of the Department of Education." Mr. Wu identified the procedures for the working session groups and then the opening session closed. The participants then joined their respective groups for the days's activities.

Corrections Education

Forum

Summaries

of

Panels

Department of Education Panel
Corrections Field Panel
Professional Organizations Panel

Department of Education Panel

Topic: Department of Education Resources and Practices in Correctional Education

Dr. Allen Wilson, Acting Deputy Director of the National Institute of Education introduced the panel members and served as moderator of this panel. In addition, he identified the availability of "Research Labs" to study and disseminate information on corrections. By July of 1985 it is anticipated that each state will have it's own research lab. Through the Office of Educational Research and Improvement there are also resources available for collecting statistics (NCES) and for assistance to institutional libraries (CLEI).

Dr. Benjamin Alexander, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Postsecondary Education addressed student aid programs available for inmate college education. The five (5) programs he identified included: 1) Pell Grants, 2) Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, 3) College Work-Study, 4) National Direct Student Loans, and 5) Guaranteed Student Loans/PLUS loans. He indicated that 7.95 million dollars had been allocated for student aid in 1984. 3.85 million was allocated for Pell grants. The 1984 maximum Pell grant award of $1,900 is expected to rise to $2,100 in 1985.

Drs. Rudy Cordova and Rudy Munis represented the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs. They discussed the thirteen basic programs funded by their office. Most of these programs focus on training components and materials development. They indicated that they were funding 53% of the applications submitted. Project grants are also available in bilingual vocational training.

Dr. Wendy Cullar, Director of Special Education Programs, represented the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. Dr. Cullar is relatively new to the federal government having only recently left the position of Florida State Director for Special Education. Dr. Cullar indicated that her office was currently funding five (5) personnel training programs to prepare educators for special education in corrections. In addition, she indicated that all of the states were eligible for P.L. 94-142 funding for handicapped, but that many correctional programs were just beginning to access the resources. An additional six (6) million dollars have been allocated for Research and Development. Current projects include studies on transition from school to employment, identification of the unique educational problems of offenders, and a manual on what rules apply to corrections. They will also be collecting statistical data on corrections.

Dr. Fred Decker, Deputy Assistant Secretary, represented the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Dr. Decker identified the variety of programs/services available through OERI. He, as did Dr. Wilson, referred to the development of Regional Labs, such as the Northwest Regional Lab that is currently funding projects in juvenile programs and in curriculum development. Expansion of this program is expected. The Center for Libraries and Educational Research enhances and expands opportunities for library services and technology for institutional and state programs. The National Diffusion Network collects and disseminates information on exemplary programs and the National Center for Education Statistics is available for information collection.

Dr. Cecilia Frantz, Deputy Assistant Secretary, represented the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. She identified four (4) programs from her office that provide resources for corrections. These programs include:

1) Chapter I, Neglected and Delinquent Resources that make available over 32 million dollars.

2) Chapter II that was allocated 500 million for block grants in 1985.

3) Title IV provides 50 million for Indian Education Programs.

4) Women's Educational Equity Programs at 6 million dollars. (Funding and dissemination of model programs)

Diane Vines, Director of the Adult Literacy Initiative, described the programs in her office. Their major effort is development of volunteerism to address literacy needs. Each state is currently establishing a structure that could be of assistance to institutional programs.

Corrections Field Panel

Topic: **Correctional Education Practices and Program Issues**

Dr. Dianne Carter, Education Program Specialist, Corrections Program, U.S. Department of Education served as moderator for the Corrections Field panel. State directors of Correctional Education representing the field included; David Carnahan (Washington), Robert Hable (Wisconsin), Petrita Hernandez-Rojas (New York), Hy Steinberg (Texas), and Raymond Vitelli (Connecticut).

Each of the presentors briefly described their correctional education programs and identified what they believed to be their strengths and weaknesses. In some instances state management structure or regulations were inhibitors to the delivery of programs while many times federal regulations were cited as impediments. The most frequently cited problems were with Chapter I and P.L. 94-142 regulations. Specific concerns dealt with the difficulty of application of the current regulations in correctional settings. Other concerns focused around the most needy population not being eligible for services. These State representatives expressed their appreciation for Federal support, but felt it may not always address the "most in need." Other issues dealt with access to federal resources, such as the variance among state programs to receive vocational education funds.

Most of the panelists indicated that they would like to have more dialogue with the Department of Education. Some suggestions centered around a National Task Force or Advisory Council. The panelists also gave strong support for the development of the Corrections Education Program in the Department of Education.

Professional Organization Representatives Panel

Topic: **The Role of Professional Organizations in Support of Correctional Education: Current Practices and Visions for the Future**

The professional organizations panel was moderated by Dr. Osa Coffey, Executive Director of the Correctional Education Association. Dr. Coffey outlined the progress that had been made in the last few years, but also drew attention to the fact that the needs of the corrections population cut across boundaries and thus made the job much more difficult. In corrections the issues are multiple and not singular as in other areas. This fact requires greater efforts in a variety of areas. She stressed the need for correctional educators to take an active role in voicing the needs of their population and in taking an advocacy role.

Dr. Gary Eyre, Executive Director of the American Association of Adult and Continuing Education spoke for his organization. Dr. Eyre expressed strong advocacy for correctional education. He indicated that his organization had a special unit for correctional institutions and that their 1984 conference was devoting 10% of its presentations to correctional education related issues. He stated that he believed that professional organizations could do more collaboration and networking. He felt that we could be more helpful to each other by sharing and being aware of each others issues. He suggested increased publishing as one remedial measure.

Dick Ford, Director of Jail Operations, represented the National Sheriffs' Association. He shared the background of his organization and indicated they had started education programs. Currently 20% of the jails have educational programs. These are new, but they are expanding. He stated that some of their problems included old jail facilities, transcient populaiton, and difficulty in recruiting employees. However, he was optimistic and stressed that he felt that the jails could play a significant role because ... "the best time to turn people around is after they hear the first clang of bars." He described it as an uphill battle in jails with the number one problem being lack of qualified personnel. He closed by asking educators to contribute articles to their journal to increase the awareness level of jail personnel for the need for educational programs.

Al Lynch, President of the National Association of Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel spoke for his organization. Mr. Lynch stressed the need for professional organizations to ban together and work toward a common mission. He recommended that a "Blue Ribbon" panel be formed from the other various professional organizations to work toward legislation of benefit to all. He also stated that he felt we could do a better job in use of existing resources. He endorsed identification of exemplary programs and dissemination of their methods, development of transition models, and focus on teacher training for correctional education including practical applications and career education.

Charlotte Nesbitt, a Director with the American Correctional Association, represented her organization. She emphasized that ACA has always supported correctional education and that they are intricately involved in policy and standards development for correctional education. She expressed that it was the position of ACA that they should continue in their efforts to be supportive of correctional education and to assist in implementing programs that are known to work.

Dr. Ted Shannon represented the American Vocational Association on the panel. Dr. Shannon stated that he believed that AVA was much less involved in correctional education issues than they could be. He recommended that alliances be built that would result in a "Block" of common interests. He believed that the machinery of AVA could be used to support and promote correctional education issues. He encouraged correctional educators to contribute to publications and to attend regional planning meetings. He endorsed open lines of communication, avoiding 'turf' guarding, and demonstrating 2-way communication. He encouraged the pursuant of research endeavors, involvement of correctional education teachers, and representations of correctional education in the AVA yearbook.

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM

OCTOBER, 1984

LUNCHEON ADDRESS

Dr. Robert M. Worthington, Ph.D.
Assistant Secretary
Office of Vocational and Adult Education

BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS
FOR
EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE IN CORRECTIONS

KEYNOTE ADDRESS AT THE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM

BY

ROBERT M. WORTHINGTON, PH.D.
ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

A NATIONAL CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM

IT IS A DISTINCT PRIVILEGE FOR ME TO WELCOME YOU TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S FORUM ON CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION, "BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE IN CORRECTIONS."

THIS FORUM IS THE RESULT OF A GREAT DEAL OF COOPERATION WITH AND ASSISTANCE FROM MANY PROGRAMS AND INDIVIDUALS IN THE DEPARTMENT. I WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS MY GRATITUDE TO ALL THOSE WHO WORKED SO HARD TO MAKE IT A REALITY, PARTICULARLY TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE, WHOSE MEMBERSHIP REPRESENTS THE OFFICES OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARIES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION HAS PLACED A HIGH PRIORITY ON CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION. OUR COMMITMENT IS SPELLED OUT IN VERY EXPLICIT TERMS IN OUR POLICY STATEMENT ON CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION:

> "THE DEPARTMENT WILL ASSIST STATE AND LOCAL JURISDICTIONS TO DEVELOP, EXPAND, AND IMPROVE THEIR DELIVERY SYSTEMS FOR ACADEMIC, VOCATIONAL, TECHNICAL, SOCIAL AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR JUVENILE AND ADULT OFFENDERS IN

ORDER TO ENHANCE THEIR OPPORTUNITIES TO BECOME LAW-ABIDING, ECONOMICALLY SELF-SUFFICIENT, AND PRODUCTIVE MEMBERS OF SOCIETY."

TO IMPLEMENT THIS COMMITMENT, WE ESTABLISHED THE CORRECTIONS PROGRAM AND CHALLENGED IT TO DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE INTEGRATED, HOLISTIC APPROACH TO CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION.

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION MUST ADDRESS THE ENTIRE SPECTRUM OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE INMATE. WHEN WE LOOK AT THE TOTAL PICTURE, IT BECOMES EVIDENT THAT WE MUST ADDRESS THE OPPORTUNITY FOR VIABLE VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT, AND IT BECOMES EQUALLY IMPORTANT THAT WE ADDRESS THE PROBLEMS OF ILLITERACY, LEARNING DISABILITIES, LIFE-SKILLS, AND SOCIAL SKILLS.

TO ADDRESS THESE BROAD NEEDS, WE HAVE ESTABLISHED THE INTRA-DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION. I CHAIR THIS COMMITTEE; MEMBERSHIP CONSISTS OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF ALL OF THE OFFICES IN THE DEPARTMENT WHOSE PROGRAMS DO HAVE OR CAN HAVE AN IMPACT ON CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION:

> THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT; THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES; THE OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION; THE OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY LANGUAGES

Affairs; the Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs; the Regional Liaison Office; and the National Literacy Initiative.

The most important work on this committee will be to coordinate policy, resource development, funding, services, and information dissemination on current and future corrections related programs within the Department.

Resources for correctional education programs do exist. Millions of dollars are available for these programs every year. But, because there has never been a coordinated approach at the federal or state levels until now, many correctional education programs have not received this assistance. The coordinating committee will grapple with the decisions on how these funds can be used more effectively. What the committee will be doing during the year and at this national conference will be to consult with those who deal with these problems at the state and local levels, so that we will learn the issues and concerns directly from the field.

We have invited you to this Forum for a two-fold purpose - to serve as an Ad Hoc Task Force on Correctional Education to our coordinating committee, and to begin planning for the 1985 National Conference on Correctional Education.

IN ISSUING A CHALLENGE TO YOU, AND THROUGH YOU, TO THE ENTIRE CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FIELD, I COULD DO NO BETTER THAN FOR CHALLENGE YOU TO THE THEME OF THIS FORUM - "BUILD RELATIONSHIPS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE IN CORRECTIONS."

THIS IN ITSELF IS ALL ENCOMPASSING!

AT EVERY LEVEL OF SOCIETY, WE ARE EXPERIENCING A RENEWED INTEREST IN CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION. THERE IS A GROWING NATIONAL AWARENESS OF AND SENSITIVITY TO THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF OFFENDERS. BUT, AT EVERY LEVEL OF SOCIETY WE ARE ALSO COGNIZANT OF THE CONCERN ABOUT THE APPARENT FAILURE OF INMATE REHABILITATION. WE NEED ONLY LOOK AT THE HIGH RECIDIVISM RATE AND THE MASSIVE UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES AMONG EX-OFFENDERS TO UNDERSTAND THE BASIS FOR THIS CONCERN.

I SUGGEST TO YOU, THAT FOR REHABILITATION TO WORK, WE MUST RETHINK OUR CURRENT REHABILITATIVE PRACTICES, AND DEVELOP A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE EDUCATIONAL AND CORRECTIONAL SYSTEMS IN ORDER TO IMPROVE THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR OFFENDERS.

IN THIS PERIOD OF ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY, SKILLS TO MEET NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT ARE ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS OF OUR NATION.

Compared to other educationally disadvantaged groups, the social and economic costs of the corrections population is extremely high. If we are to adequately address these societal problems and concerns, we must take positive, cooperative action to "build relationships for educational excellence in corrections."

And that is what this Forum is all about. That is what the National Conference on Correctional Education in 1985 is all about.

I am extremely optimistic about the future of correctional education in the Department of Education.

We have the Corrections Program; We have the Correctional Education Policy Statement; We have the Intra-Departmental Coordinating Committee; and, We have been working to develop the state directors network on correctional education.

Congress has just passed the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act which directs each state to use one percent of its federal appropriation under Title II "To provide, Vocational Education services and activities designed to meet the special needs of, and to enhance the participation of... (6) criminal offenders who are serving in a correctional institution."

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION IS BUILDING MOMENTUM. BUT, WE MUST CAPITALIZE ON THIS MOMENTUM AND ACTIVELY BUILD RELATIONSHIPS IF WE TRULY EXPECT EXCELLENCE IN CORRECTIONS EDUCATION.

AN EXCELLENT EXAMPLE OF WHAT CAN BE DONE BY BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS AND CAPITALIZING ON EXISTING PROGRAMMING IS THE DEPARTMENT'S INITIATIVE ON EDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL CENTERS. THE PRESIDENT, IN RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S TASK FORCE ON VIOLENT CRIME, PROMISED TO ASSIST STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ACQUIRING SURPLUS PROPERTIES TO ALLEVIATE THE OVERCROWDED CONDITIONS IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS. HOWEVER, CURRENT LAW DID NOT ALLOW TRANSFER OF SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES.

INSPIRED BY CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER'S CONCEPT THAT EVERY PRISON SHOULD BE "A SCHOOL WITH A FENCE," AND DRIVEN BY THE PRESIDENT'S DESIRE TO WORK ON THIS CRITICAL PROBLEM AREA, WE BEGAN TO RESEARCH OUR EXISTING AUTHORITIES FOR POSSIBLE SOURCES OF FUNDING. WE DISCOVERED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION HAS THE AUTHORITY UNDER THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT TO REQUEST THE TRANSFER OF SURPLUS FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY TO STATE AND LOCAL JURISDICTIONS FOR USE AS EDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL CENTERS. WE THEN BEGAN TO FOCUS OUR EFFORTS ON THIS PROGRAM TO EXPAND THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THESE TRANSFERS TO BE MADE THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY.

WITHIN THE LAST TWO YEARS, THREE SUCH TRANSFERS HAVE OCCURRED - AN AIR FORCE STATION IN MAINE, AN AIR FORCE BASE IN NEW YORK, AND A FORMER FEDERAL PRISON IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON ARE BEING REVITALIZED INTO EDUCATIONAL CENTERS FOR OFFENDERS. OTHER PROJECTS ARE IN VARIOUS STAGES OF PROCESSING.

THE SIGNIFICANT BENEFITS DERIVED FROM INVESTING IN THESE EDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL CENTERS ARE MANY. THE MOST OBVIOUS ONE IS TO PROVIDE SOON TO BE RELEASED INMATES WITH QUALITY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS WHICH WILL ENABLE THEM TO BECOME LAW-ABIDING, ECONOMICALLY SELF-SUFFICIENT, AND PRODUCTIVE MEMBERS OF FREE SOCIETY.

HOWEVER, FOR THIS PROGRAM TO BE EFFECTIVE, IT REQUIRES DEFINITE AND EXPLICIT COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTAL AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED: THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION MUST ASSIGN THE PROPERTIES REQUESTED BY THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT; STATE OFFICIALS MUST ENDORSE THIS CATEGORY OF CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES; THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT MUST ASSIST IN DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ON THIS PROGRAM TO THE APPROPRIATE STATE AGENCIES; EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS MUST ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIGH QUALITY ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS, AND IN THE PREPARATION OF THE APPLICATION.

SO IT IS WITH ALL ASPECTS OF CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION -- TO BE EFFECTIVE, IT DEMANDS DEFINITE AND EXPLICIT COOPERATION OF THE GOVERNMENTAL AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE-SECTORS.

THIS FORUM AND THE SUBSEQUENT NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION IN 1985 AFFIRMS OUR COMMITMENT TO BUILDING THESE NECESSARY RELATIONSHIPS.

ASSEMBLED HERE ARE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CORRECTIONAL FIELD; REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EDUCATIONAL FIELD; REPRESENTATIVES OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS FROM BOTH THE EDUCATIONAL AND CORRECTIONAL FIELDS; AND, THE ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

WE ARE HERE ASSEMBLED TO BEGIN DEVELOPING A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION; WE ARE HERE TO BEGIN PLANNING FOR THE NATIONAL CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE; AND, WE ARE HERE TO BEGIN BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE IN CORRECTIONS.

MY CHARGE TO YOU IS BEST EXPRESSED IN THE EXHORTATION OF SECRETARY BELL TO THE ASSISTANT SECRETARIES AT THE FIRST MEETING OF THE INTRA-DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION:

"We are hosting a Forum on Correctional Education, ... one of the themes that we have consistently emphasized is that of Partnerships, and this committee, cutting across program lines, is an excellent example of the kind of cooperative relationships that we hope to encourage at the state and local levels.

This Forum will be a working meeting, and will be product oriented. The products which come out of this Forum will be very important to this committee and to the Department in our 1985 activities on behalf of correctional education.

We need your help in identifying the areas of overlap and gaps in our correctional education programs. Our goal is to develop educational excellence in programs for offenders, and to initiate practices that ensure that this happens.

I know I can count on you to make this important initiative (of the Reagan Administration) successful. Thank you for your support."

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM

SUMMARY
OF
WORKING SESSION

Closing Summaries
of
Working Sessions

At the closing session the facilitators of the small working groups each gave brief reports of the products from their sessions. It was decided that each group would delete comments on the characteristics of the population and address the areas of impediments to service, innovations and solutions to impediments, and recommendations for a national conference in 1985. (Detailed reports from each of these groups may be found in a later section of this document.)

Group I, Black Group
Facilitator: John Linton

Impediments:

1. Internal movement of prisoners
2. Lack of transition services and coordination
3. Programs are not student-centered
4. Lack of access to federal resources due to regulations and lack of information
5. Lack of Correctional Education Advocacy
6. Limited public support
7. Difficult to attract qualified personnel
8. Unaddressed needs of special populations, eg. women, handicapped, and segregated populations.
9. Correctional education is not a state or national priority
10. Age barriers to resources; give consideration to using existing resources for those in greatest need.
11. Student pull-out problems; inconsistent school attendance

Innovations and Solutions:

1. Assign responsibility for correctional education to a specific state agency.
2. Involve State Boards and Chief State School Officers
3. Pass the Federal Correctional Education Assistance Act
4. Target and recruit federal support in a few prime areas initially and then move on to other areas of need.
5. Focus some efforts in preventative interventions
6. Place greater emphasis on research and dissemination
7. Provide advocacy and support programs for inmates returning to the community.
8. Tap discretionary sources in each entitlement
9. Development better use of existing resources
10. Increase staff training options
11. Pool research capabilities

Conference Recommendations:

These included involvement of teachers, private sector, LEA's, judges, Department of Justice, media, federal offices and members of congress. Suggestion for format were general, but with a focus on a theme stressing communication, partnerships, excellence in correctional education and improved public relations.

Group II, Blue Group
Facilitator: Dr. T.A. Ryan

Impediments:

1. Inadequate facilities
2. Competition over existing resources
3. Unclear CE purpose
4. Lack of public policy for correctional education
5. Age restrictions on existing funding programs
6. Lack of a Master Plan for corrections
7. Lack of qualified staff
8. Lack of agency coordination and research

Innovations and Solutions:

1. Seek support, advocate for appropriate legislation/ amendments to serve CE
2. Focus on transition services for CE clients
3. Establish networks for information and research exchange
4. Set up block grants for funding for correctional education
5. Establish a presidential advisory committee
6. Establish a field Task Force for evaluation of programs
7. Establish a Federal Master Plan for Correctional Education

Conference Recommendations:

Recommendations were for a large conference that would extend for 2 to 3 days to be held in October, 1985.

A desire was expressed for a central location and a conference that would have follow-up activities at the regional level. Recommendations also included a debate on opposing viewpoints, exhibits, and time for special interest groups. Emphasis was also placed on development of an action plan for correctional education and the inclusion of training workshops and work sessions in critical need areas in correctional education.

Group III, Pink Group
Facilitator: Randy Shipe

Impediments:

1. Lack of resource coordination
2. Insensitivity of federal law to correctional education
3. Insensitivity of federal regulations to correctional education environment and needs
4. Lack of trained staff
5. Reduced fiscal resources with limited or no set asides

Innovations and Solutions:

1. Development of an effective lobby for CE
2. Mandates for communication and linkages among state agencies and correctional education settings
3. Formation of a State/Federal Coordinating Committee on Correctional Education
4. Establishment of state/federal memo of agreement on waiver of regulations where appropriate
5. Maintenance and expansion of the Corrections Education Program in the Department of Education
6. Establishment of a newsletter for communication of information
7. Work toward resource set asides for CE

Conference Recommendations:

Recommendations were for an October 1985 conference that would narrow its focus to specific issues. Suggestions included presentations of innovative programs, workshops on legislative action, grant proposal writing, research reports, and discussion of rules and regulations governing funding resources.

Group IV, Red Group
Facilitator: Becky Smith

Impediments:

1. Too much dependence on willingness of state and federal governments to assist CE, resulting in permissive not mandated legislation.
2. CE is expected to do too much with too little
3. Lack of a CE master plan
4. Lack of qualified staff, licensing standards, and appropriate training programs

Innovations and Solutions:

1. Establish a field based Task Force to review policies for the Intra-Departmental Coordinating Committee on Correctional Education. Use this Task Force for other purposes as well.
2. Conduct research on the offender population and disseminate results.
3. Establish a correctional education program in the state office of each state.
4. Develop a national association of state directors of correctional education. Increase communications.

Conference Recommendations:

Replicate the Prison Industries Conference model used at GWU in June of 1984. (National media focus with involvement of the nation's leaders). Prepare issues documents in advance and share with the field. Involve Chief Justice Burger, Secretary of Education, and members of Congress.

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM

WORKING SESSION
FORMS

Correctional Education Forum

Special Needs in Corrections

Working Session

October 23, 1984

9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Participants will identify client characteristics relevant to specialized educational needs of the offender population including remedial programs (Special Education and Chapter I), bilingual education, education in segregation, and equality in educational opportunities for female offenders.

2. Participants will identify the impediments to the provision and delivery of educational services as perceived by the Department of Education, the Correction's field, and other federal agency and professional organizational personnel.

3. Participants will, in combined effort, identify and recommend modifications and innovations for removal of the impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

4. Participants will discuss the parameters within which they must operate (fiscal and otherwise) and also identify those available resources or possible modifications that could be utilized to initiate innovations in the provision of correctional education services.

5. Participants will identify major topics, program format, recommended participants, and a theme for a 1985 National Correctional Education Conference.

PROCEDURES:

Each participant in the working sessions will be provided with instructions relevant to the tasks and desired outcomes. It is the responsibility of the Forum participants to contribute, to their maximum ability, input in the areas requested. It is the responsibility of the group facilitator to provide direction, clarification, to keep the group on task, collect individual input, and secure closure on the desired outcomes.

General Procedures include:

1. Directions from the group facilitator.
2. Individual recording of responses to requests for input.
3. Group sharing of individual responses.
4. Clarification of input.
5. Prioritization of major issues and recommended remedial actions and suggestions for the National Conference.
6. Summary of input from the facilitator and collection of individual working papers.

Special Needs Working Session

1. Identify client characteristics relevant to the specialized educational needs of the offender population including remedial programs (Special Education and Chapter I), bilingual education, education in segregation, and equality in educational opportunities for female offenders.

2. Identify the impediments to the provision and delivery of educational services as perceived by the Department of Education, the Corrections field, and other federal agency and professional organizational personnel.

3. Recommend modifications and innovations for removal of impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

4. Identify those available resources or possible modifications that could be utilized to initiate innovations in the provision of correctional education services.

5. For the 1985 National Conference recommend major topics, program format, participants, and theme.

Topics:

Format:

Participants:

Theme:

Other Areas:

Correctional Education Forum

General Education Issues in Corrections

Working Session

October 23, 1984

1:15 - 3:15 p.m.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Participants will identify client characteristics relevant to general educational issues of the offender population including vocational education, adult and postsecondary education, literacy, basic education, and other issues of general concern.

2. Participants will identify the impediments to the provision and delivery of educational services as perceived by the Department of Education, the Correction's field, and other federal agency and professional organization personnel.

3. Participants will, in combined effort, identify and recommend modifications and innovations for removal of the impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

4. Participants will discuss the parameters within which they must operate (fiscal and otherwise) and also identify those available resources or possible modifications that could be utilized to initiate innovations in the provision of correctional education services.

5. Participants will identify major topics, program format, recommended participants, and a theme for a 1985 National Correctional Education Conference.

PROCEDURES:

Each participant in the working sessions will be provided with instructions relevant to the tasks and desired outcomes. It is the responsibility of the Forum participants to contribute, to their maximum ability, input in the areas requested. It is the responsibility of the group facilitator to provide direction, clarification, to keep the group on task, collect individual input, and secure closure on the desired outcomes.

General procedures includes:

1. Directions from the group facilitator.
2. Individual recording of responses to requests for input.
3. Group sharing of individual responses.
4. Clarification of input.
5. Prioritization of major issues and recommended remedial actions and suggestions for the National Conference.
6. Summary of input from the facilitator and collection of individual working papers.

General Education Issues in Corrections

Working Session

1. Identify client characteristics relevant to the general educational issues of the offender population including vocational education, adult and postsecondary education, literacy, basic education, and other issues of general concern.

2. Identify the impediments to the provision and delivery of educational services as perceived by the Department of Education, the Corrections field, and other federal agency and professional organizational personnel.

3. Recommend modifications and innovations for removal of impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

4. Identify those available resources or possible modifications that could be utilized to initiate innovations in the provision of correctional education services.

5. For the 1985 National Conference recommend major topics, program format, participants, and theme.

Topics:

Format:

Participants:

Theme:

Other Areas:

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM

WORKING SESSION

DOCUMENTS

Working Session

Report

Facilitator: Becky Smith

Recorder : Osa Coffey
and
Jim Parker

Red Group

Correctional Education Forum

Special Needs in Corrections

Red Group
Facilitator: Becky Smith

Special Educational Needs

- 25-40% "handicapped"
  (L.D., physical, etc.)
- ESL need (some states)
  (speak, read and write little or no English)
- Non-Readers (illiterate)
- gifted/exceptional
- undocumented people (aliens)
- different value/cultural systems (from other countries)
- native language, literacy
- sex offenders
- separated from family (isolated)
- segregated/"assaltive"
- mentally ill (disturbed)
- female offenders (4% State/Federal)
- high academic achievers

General Educational Needs

- (Able) 5.5 "grade level" adult
- unemployable
- unskilled, 75%
- not employed when arrested, 55%
- have not had adequate career/vocational counseling
- lower mentality (all)
- lack of life and career skills (all)

- poor communication skills
- disproportionate number of minorities (vs. general population)
- 80 + % are poor
- poor study habits (all)
- drug involvement
- child abuse
- poor family ties
- previously untreated medical problems (possibly a majority)
- parental neglect
- sexual deviant (lack of responsibility)
- lack of social/interpersonal responsibility
- unsuccessful placements in correctional systems (previously) (all)
- lack support systems (personal and societal)
- young
- urban
- poor/inadequate school experiences
- families have history of criminal activity
- poor self-image
- "average" I.Q./low educational achievement
- 80% leave education before age 16
- against society's exceptations/rules, deviant value systems

Impediments to the Delivery of Educational Systems

1. Funding is restricted to special populations
    - Learning disabled/ handicapped/emotionally/disturbed (forced to manipulated classifications to use
2. No Federal Act for correctional education that has been funded.

3. Small numbers of certain populations, women, non-English speaking, etc.

4. Educational funds are permissive, but not mandated (generally)

5. Depend on willingness of state and federal agencies to cooperate

6. Political limitations as to "how much education should inmates get"

7. Federal regulations are geared to school systems.

8. Lack of timely information about Federal and State (Education, Labor, Justice)

9. Few States are LEAs (8+)

10. Variety of agencies responsible for correctional education in some states.

11. Lack of trained personnel

12. No centralized coordinating agency at Federal level

Modifications and Innovations for Removal of Impediments

1. Identify specific problems in Federal legislation and regulations that are impediments

2. Dialog with Federal agencies on #1

3. Intra-Departmental Coordinating Committee will establish a field-based task group to (#2.a.2 of charter) review policies and regulations, to identify problems and make recommendations to improve.

   - funding
   - access to information
   - civil rights

4. Special funding for research - Get NIE to do study of offender population

Resources

1. Coordinating Committee
2. CEA
3. State Directors Network
4. New legislation
5. NIE/regional labor
6. NDN - National Diffusion Network

7. Fund a clearinghouse for correctional education
8. Logitudinal Study - NIE
9. Initiate systematized and specialized data collection on correctional education

General Education Issues in Correctional Education

Working Session

Red Group
Facilitator: Becky Smith

Impediments:

1. CE expected to do more than is possible, given funding and institutional limitations;

2. Time frame in which we have to deliver short sentences and placement;

3. Problems that result from inmate separation;

4. Vocational education - lack of space, outmoded equipment, training not based on job market needs; curricula not up to date; limitations due to security requirements; poor linkages between prison industry/vocational training and academic/vocational education; insufficient prevocational; inadequate transitional services/programs;

5. Federal funding uncoordinated and meeting ad hoc requests and needs without adequate attention to broader/national relevance and applicability.

6. Inadequate involvement of CE field in planning and RFP process.

7. Vocational Education Act regulations frequently preclude implementation in corrections due to restrictions in terms of overall length of program and hours/day;

8. Institutional schedule/routine and mindset not conducive to teaching "employability skills";

9. Lack of licensing standards for education; and

10. Lack of masterplan for CE by agency, involving all relevant staff and agencies (local, state, federal)

Innovations and Modification

1. ED should insist that every state plan include what they will do in corrections.

2. ED should enforce its own rules, e.g. correctional representation on SACVE's.

3. Clarify roles of various state agencies in terms of their responsibility to incarcerated.

4. Each state department of education should have a "Corrections Program" and coordinating committee along the lines of current initiatives in ED.

5. Have a NASDCE/Superintendent of Education.

Available Resources and Possible Modifications

1. Discretionary funds (Dr. Worthington)
2. Private Industry
3. NDN (National Diffusion Network)
4. Social Service agencies
5. ED fund a Corrections Program in NCRVE annually
6. FY'86 NCRVE use source of extra monies for corrections
7. ED assist CE field in better accessing existing resources

National Conference Recommendations

Purpose:

1. Develop National Awareness of Correctional Education and Society's Interest in Strengthening CE Delivery

2. Create Legislative, Federal/State/Local Government Support

3. Create Professional Identity for Correctional Education

4. Coordination and Cooperation

Recommendation

1. Central Conference with satellite state conferences/and/or teleconferences

Theme

Education for Freedom
Education for the Future of the Nation
Excellence in Education
A Nation at Risk
Schools Behind Bars - Meeting the Chief Justice's Challenge

Participants

1. Educational leadership from states
2. Funding sources
3. Legislators
4. Commissioners of Corrections
5. School Superintendents
6. Get Co-sponsors
7. National Organizations/Associations
8. Program Development and Evaluation/Assessment Specialists

Recommendation

ED fund immediately a document in advance of conference - CE State of the Art

Topics

1. How can we influence Congress to get better legislation?
2. How can we improve our communications?
3. What can we reasonably be responsible for?
4. Exemplary CE Programs
5. Nationally Available Resources

Working Session
Report

Facilitator: T.A. Ryan
Recorder : Steve Swisher

Blue Group

Blue Group

Facilitator: T. A. Ryan

General

OBJECTIVE

1. Identify client characteristics relevant to the general educational issues of the offender population including vocational education, adult and post-secondary education, literacy, basic education, and other issues of general concern.

The group identified client characteristics relevant to the general education issues of the offender. These characteristics are interpreted as general in nature and are common (as the rule) with the great majority of our offender population. These characteristics focus in the areas of educational disadvantaged needs, sociological/psychological needs and economic needs. But, because of the intricate intermeshing and relationship each of these characteristics impacts the student as a whole being, the group prefereed to list the following general needs rather than to categorize/label.

General needs include:

1. Lack of self-confidence.
2. Lack of ability to set realistic goals.
3. Inability to assume life's roles.
4. Lack/distortion of values.
5. Poor health/nutrition practices.
6. Lack of life skills.
7. Lack of stable family history.
8. History of child/sexual abuse.
9. History of substance dependency/abuse.
10. History of failure.
11. Mistrust of systems.
12. Fear of education.
13. Poor general knowledge base.
14. Poor study skills.
15. Functionally illiterate (lacking literacy skills).
16. Lack of communication skills.
17. Absent from educational environment (school) for some time.
18. Lack of marketable job skills.
19. Stigmatized in career and everyday living goals by criminal record.
20. Inability and/or desire to plan for future.
21. Economically disadvantaged.

Blue Group

Facilitator: T. A. Ryan

Special

OBJECTIVE

1. Identify client characteristics relevant to the specialized educational issues of the offender population including vocational education, adult and postsecondary education, literacy, basic education, and other issues of general concern.

In the time allotted, the group generated/identified specific characteristics of the clients relevant to the specialized educational needs. These characteristics are supplemental/additional to those characteristics identified within Objective #1 of General Education Issues in Corrections and are not intended to be comprehensive but rather clearly identified for significant needs of significant numbers within our client populations.

The special needs based on:

1. Ethnic origin (not merely major ethnic groupings, but focusing also on the very minor ethnic representations).
2. Cultural Disadvantaged/Difference.
3. Gender (unique special needs of not only the female, a minority population, but also of the male client).
4. Age.
5. Handicapping Conditions (all 11 handicapping exhibited as categorized by PL 94-142), however, specifically identifying
    - Learning Disabled
    - Emotionally Disturbed
    - Mentally Retarded
    - Serious Emotionally Disturbed
    - Physically Handicapped
6. Highly motivated/achievers.

Blue Group

Facilitator: T. A. Ryan

General/Special

OBJECTIVE

2. Identify the impediments to the provision and delivery of education services as perveived by the Department of Education, the Corrections field, and other federal agency and professional organizational personnel.

The group identified the following impediments to the delivery of educational services of the offender population. These impediments can be loosely categorized into the following general areas: facilities, policies/regulations, staff, programs and materials, attitudes, evaluation, research and information dissemination. More specifically, the following impediments are:

I. Facilities
  A. Inadequate program areas.
  B. Overcrowded.
  C. Competition for the client.
  D. Students removed from programs for disciplinary/institutional reasons.
  E. Indeterminate length of stay at each facility.

II. Policies/Regulations
  A. Unclear purpose, goals, commitment from governing agency (Division of Correction, SDE or other).
  B. Limited funding.
  C. Lack of Public Policy in reference to political climate.
  D. Eligibility requirements and regulation interpretation are not geared correctional setting.
  E. Non-specific legislation.
  F. Emphasis on security funding rather than on Ed./Rehab. Programs
  G. Funding based on age and location rather than need.
  H. Court Orders.
  I. Economics of Scale (few members).
  J. Lack of national/state master plans.

III. Staff
  A. Lack of qualified trained teaching staff.
  B. Lack of qualified/trained custodial staff.
  C. Lack of certification standards.

IV. Programs, Materials and Equipment.
  A. Inadequate Educational Programming (lack purposefulness - out of date).
  B. Lack of Holistic approach.
  C. Inadequate quality and appropriateness of materials and equipment.
  D. Lack of program articulation.
  E. Lack of appropraite student assessment data.

V. Attitudes
  A. Lack of Educational Equity for Education.
  B. Philosophy/Attitude of Administrators and other staff.

VI. Evaluation, Research, Coordination of Information
  A. Lack of inter/intra-departmental coordination (i.e., fragmentation).
  B. Lack of adequate information linkage at state/federal levels.
  C. Lack of Research data.
  D. Absence of representation on appropriate organizational decision making bodies (i.e., Voc. Ed. Advisory Council).

Blue Group

Facilitator: T. A. Ryan

General/Special

OBJECTIVE

3. Recommend modifications and innovations for removal of impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

The recommendations of the group focused on strategies in the general areas of dissemination, legislation, leadership advocacy, program development, educational training, coordination and resource sharing, outside support linkages, planning evaluation and research. Specific recommendations follow (not in priority order):

1. Seek support, advocate appropriate legislation/ammendments to serve correctional education.
2. Identify and use all governmental inter/intra-agencies that could provide services to Correctional Education.
3. Focus on transitional services for our clients.
4. Establish networks through information exchanges, publications in journals and newsletters.
5. Apply for Block Grant monies.
6. Encourage legal advocacy and clarification on pertinent issues.
7. Encourage support from foundations, businesses,private sector, education, public information sources and volunteers.
8. Mandate that evidence of coordination be tied to funding.
9. Modify/improve curriculum.
10. Establish inter/intra-agency agreements.
11. Establish interstate committees with follow-up.
12. Develop guidelines for program implementation.
13. Tailor regulations/policies to incorporate correcional ed. needs.
14. Call for Presidential appointed Nat'l Advisory Council.
15. Monitor employment and staff utilization statistics to maintain proper staffing patterns.
16. Share available facilities.
17. Develop standards for facilities (program space):
    - -to accommodate flexible schedules.
    - -accommodate modern technological equipment.
18. Share and disseminate program materials and curricula.
19. Develop and disseminate models.
20. Use Nat'l Diffusion Network.
21. Support goals and initiatives of Dept. of Education in the Corrections Program.
22. Avoid duplication of efforts in all areas.
23. Coordinate evaluation/research when appropriate.
24. Seek to standardize documentation and data collection.
25. Encourage requests through JTPA projects.
26. Encourage participation and networking through a coalition of professional organizations/associations.
27. Utilize Nat'l Center for Educational Statistics (data clearing house).
28. Continue joint planning initiatives involving field/state/federal staffs.
29. Develop policy/standards.
30. Link to community resources.
31. Call for AdHoc Committee to work with U.S.D.E., Interdepartmental Coordinating Committee and Correction Program.
32. Establish the evaluation and publication of Directory of Correspondence courses.
33. Involve SPA's.

Blue Group

Facilitator: T. A. Ryan

General/Special

34. Develop leadership of correctional educators.
35. Identify and utilize international organizations, i.e. United Nations to support correctional education.
36. Develop and implement a positive stance.

Blue Group

Facilitator: T. A. Ryan

General/Special

OBJECTIVE

4. Identify those available resources or possible modifications that could be utilized to initiate innovations in the provision of correctional education services.

Identification of Resources

1. The most important and significant resource is the teacher.
2. U.S. Department Ed. Programs, Centers, Labs
3. Industry.
4. Federal Grants/Initiatives: Discretionary and Formula.
5. Volunteers.
6. State Legislatures.
7. Conferences, Forums, Associations.
8. Public and private media.
9. Client/Families: Community Support Groups.
10. International Resources and Exchanges (DE).
11. Private sectors.
12. S.E.A.'s.
13. Professional Organizations.
14. Networks: Field, State and Federal Agencies.
15. Court Orders/Litigation.
16. A.C.A. Standards.
17. Higher Education: University, College, Community College.
18. Religious groups.
19. Military groups.
20. Labor Unions.
21. Foundations.

Parameters

1. Length of stay.
2. Security Level Classification.
   Safety of institution and general population.
3. Funding levels.
4. Space Limitations/Physically Restricted Environment.
5. Sub-System.
6. Lowest priority in Public Education.
7. Public perceptions/attitudes.
8. 3 T's: Turf, Tradition, Trust.
9. Policy.
10. Legislation/Regulations.
11. Standards.
12. Mission.
13. Laws/Contracts. Re: Employees population.

Blue Group

Facilitator: T. A. Ryan

General/Special

OBJECTIVE

5. For the 1985 National Conference recommend major topics, program format, participants, and theme.

Mission: Theme

Agenda for Action: Implement 1984 FORUM Outcomes.

Participant:

Ethic organizations
Business and Industry
SDE Managers
Selected Corr. Ed.: local state/federal Adult and Juv.
Teams: State org.
Legislatures, commissioners, congress reps.
Federal agency reps., i.e. justice, agriculture, interior, HEW, Ed. Military
Media

Size:

800 - 250 participants
2½ - 3 days

When:

October, 1985

Location:

Centrally located or/
subsidization for length of travel for participants.

Resource Persons:

1. Dept. of Defense
2. Immigration and Naturalization Dept.
3. Regional Laboratories/Centers

Topics:

Successful Practices
Priorities for Technology Research
Funding Resources
Strategies for coordinating inter/intra agency activities
Establishing priorities in CE
Roles & Responsibilities of media
High cost of doing nothing
Systematic Planning Implementation and Evaluation at a National Level with Implementing Delivery System Plans

Blue Group

Facilitator: T. A. Ryan

General/Special

Format:

1. Planned segments for participant interaction
2. Exhibits
3. Nat'l one year; Regional next
4. Keynote Speaker
5. Major sessions
6. Resource Centers - Hospitality room approach
7. Debate of issues
8. Special Interest Groups; i.e., Directors
9. Overall: A working session that will develop an action plan for implementation and evaluation

6.1

Working Session
Report

Facilitator: John Linton
Recorder : Bill Wienke

Black Group

Educational Issues in Correctional Education
Working Session

Black Group

Facilitator: John Linton

I. Characteristics/Needs

General

1. undereducated (2+ grade levels below)
2. lack of work skills
3. no employment record
4. low self-esteem
6. low cognitive development
7. poor study skills
8. school drop-outs
9. lack of proper social skills
10. high aggression (low assertiveness)
11. youthful (under 30)
12. unaware of career options
13. lack of health awareness
14. life skills (lacking)
    - money management
    - family planning
15. variable range of abilities
    - low to average IQ
16. unrealistic personal goals and expectations
17. lack of internal controls
18. a deviant value system
19. immature moral development
20. ten to be school truants

Specific

1. limited english (poor vocabulary)
2. substance abusers disabilities include -
    1. learning disabilities
    2. visual disabilities
    3. hearing impairments
    4. mental retardation
    5. emotional disturbances
    6. mobility impairments
    7. health problems
    8. problems with segregation
    9. unwed mothers
    10. family separation (females)
    11. child bearing age - children born in jails
    12. lack of parenting skills
    13. alienated - short residency in an area

History of Family Problems

1. abuse
2. brutality
3. disintegration
4. child abuse
5. sexual abuse

Demographics

1. minorities prevail
2. urban
3. usually male

II. Impediments

A. Movements within the system
   1. early departure (short terms)

B. Lack of transition
   1. preparation for release
   2. poor coordination with aftercare programs
      a. knowledge of adult education services in the community
   3. lack aftercare services
   4. no school based transition programs
   5. lack of "welcome" in the community
   6. resources in local system (education)
   7. coordination of the delivery system (duplication)

C. Not a student centered approach

D. Legislation and regulations
   1. SEA, involvement in compliance
   2. restrictions on serving the clients (state agencies precluded)
   3. problem with age requirements e.g. Chapter I, P.L. 94-142
   4. no CE input on laws and regulations
   5. ignorance of what is available
   6. lack of public support
      a. putting resources into the prisons
   7. staffing
      a. training problems
      b. making job attractive; concerns are:
         1. pay
         2. working conditions
         3. status
         4. isolation
   8. special confinement concerns

9. state priorities and permissive federal legislation
    a. lack of political base
    b. lack of awareness of resources
    c. lack of involvement of SEA and Feds in meeting needs
    d. lack of SEA awareness of issues
10. awareness of CE resources
11. high numbers due to turnovers and rigid reporting requirements
12. pull-out for institutional business
13. lack of research
14. fear of federal stipulations and soft money

III. Innovations (Solutions)

A. An assigned SEA representative who knows CE programs
    1. need to get those people involved

B. Inviting the state board to meet in corrections facilities
    1. inform them of CE programs
    2. meet key staff people

C. Invite council of the chief state school officers

D. Lobby for correctional education

E. High number problems
    1. bonus for turnover (more than F.T.E. #) by amendment to law

F. Operational problems
    1. continuity
    2. internal solutions

G. Passage of Federal Correctional Education Assistance Act

H. Setting aside a targeted funding source

I. Tap discretionary source in each entitlement

J. Rehabilitation funds on a case by case basis

K. Prevention programs
    1. school attendance enforcement
    2. counseling in the elementary schools
    3. greater use of the IEP in adult education

IV. Modification/Resources

A. Local (LEA) funding to follow the client entry into state programs

B. School based transition program ("Youth Advocate Liaison")
  1. transition person
    a. inservice
    b. coordinator
  2. client advocate

C. Greater use of IEP for all students

D. Attitudes toward SEA staff of those in corrections welcome and involve and recognize ability

E. Get staff people out for greater contact
  1. creative inservices
  2. local involvement inservice material selection
  3. decentralization
  4. A.B.E. funds - target on inservice and networking

F. Mainstreaming of the staff
  1. inservices
  2. certification
  3. accreditation

G. Be identified at state level as a priority for training (special education) to get money for inservices

H. Use educational technology for special confinement
  1. correspondence
  2. telephone
  3. video
  4. rotate staff assignments

I. Co-education

J. Creative pay systems
  1. incentives over local scales

K. Transition support
  1. employment funding (models exist)

L. Research

M. Mandatory set-aside for research - ADE law
  1. Ohio State Project
  2. evaluation component of the Vocational Education Act

N. Dissemination of research
  1. cooperative projects
  2. Ohio State Project

O. Practitioners
  1. research with graduate level training

P. University connections

Q. Strengthening national C.E.A.
    1. increase visibility in D.C.
    2. make people more aware of CE issues

R. Employment experiences through industry

S. Private industry in prison
    1. employment experiences
    2. work with the same employer after release

National Conference Recommendations

V. Theme

A. Building relationships

B. Excellence in correctional education

C. Partnership

D. National initiative

VI. Topics

A. Model programs
    1. juvenile and adults
    2. show and tell

B. How to work the system and the systems
    1. areas of concern coming from today's work groups
    2. federal/state getting resources, financial and other ways

C. A concern: (can we act on today's ideas without just recreating this again in six months)?
    1. ideas to publish
    2. build on today's work
    3. assign responsibilities for follow-up
    4. expand committees/field people

D. Using business/industry/labor resources (people and ideas)

E. Awareness - developing relationships

F. Effectiveness of alternative programs
    1. halfway houses
    2. youth advocate liaison
    3. model employment placement

G. Transition services

H. Educate the public (include the jails)

I. Role of coordinating committees
   1. field expectations of ED (an executive secretary)
   2. use priority list from evaluation forms

VII. Participants

A. Private/industry labor

B. Representatives from existing councils
   1. e.g. Washington State's roundtable model

C. SEA and local
   1. special education
   2. vocational education
   3. adult education
   4. post secondary
   5. elementary education
   6. rehabilitation people
   7. J.T.P.A. (Department of Labor)
   8. judges
   9. sheriffs (as speakers)
   10. correctional administrators
   11. associations (state school officers)
   12. legislators
   13. Department of Justice
   14. media people (as resources)
   15. media coverage
   16. Bell; Burger; Pell
   17. President of the United States
   18. proclamation - resolution in congress
   19. university researchers

VIII. Format

A. Speeches
   1. keynote
   2. open

B. Workshops (media)

C. Alternative sessions

D. Options
   1. film festival
   2. presentations (model programs)
   3. swap shops
      a. distribute materials at conference
   4. exhibitors

Working Session

Report

Facilitator: Randy Shipe

Recorder : John Platt

Pink Group

Educational Issues in Correctional Education
Working Sessions

Pink Group

Facilitator: Randy Shipe

A. Characteristics of Population

1. Economically and educationally disadvantaged
2. Dropouts
   a. handicapped
   b. disaffected-disassociated
   c. SLD
   d. low base skills - vocational and academic
   e. attitude toward authority is defiance
   f. behavior problems
   g. abused-sexual, physical, psychological
3. Can't work within the system or structure which has been developed due to social or emotional skill deficits
4. Frequently are street people broken homes - lack of jobs skills and job readiness skills
5. Frequently are mentally retarded or emotionally ill - who have been deinstitutionalized
6. Mentally retarded tend to be frequently exploited
7. History of substance abuse
8. Disproportionate minority representation
9. Tend to be repeat offenders
10. Unmotivated, lack structure
11. Tend to be impulsive, tend toward immediate self gratification
12. Chronic and significant academic failure

B. Impediments to programs

*1. Public does not want to spend money on inmates
2. Length of stay is either too short or too long, structures are unresponsive to these differences
*3. Lack of resource coordination
4. Nature and purpose of institution - is not rehabilitatively oriented
5. Lack of up-to-date physical plants
6. Lack of qualified personnel
7. Lack of team support from top down
8. Diversity of population

*outside of institution

*9. Lack of professional networking and dissemination
10. Lack of direction (perspective) for staff (isolation of staff)
11. Most organized institutions (long term) tend to have least motivated inmates (longtimers) and vice versa
*12. Age limitations of Federal programs, i.e., Chapter #1, P.L. 94-142
13. Disruptions (i.e., lockdown) cause lack of continuity of program
*14. Federal law (guidelines) insensitive to correctional education, i.e., P.L. 94-142, IEP regulations, Chapter #1:
   a. surrogate parent issue
   b. appropriate assessment
      1. training of personnel
      2. appropriate assessment instrumentation
         a. identification
         b. intervention
      3. culturally different
      4. time limits to complete assessment
   c. identify problem with funding - sources of funds, Chapter #1, & 94-142
15. Lack of understanding of handicapped inmates
16. Inservice for "regular educators on characteristics of handicapped inmates"
17. Securing Special Education teachers for correctional institutions
18. Transition to community and world of work
*19. Chapter #1
   a. non waiver provision
   b. parental involvement-how can this requirement be met?
   c. annual parental meeting (sec. 204.2)
   d. 204.23 - sustained gains - movement of prisoners makes gains a problem
   e. amount of time to get into the program
   f. age cut-off
   g. cooperation between local neglected and delinquent state correctional facilities and L.E.A.
*20. Cooperation between corrections and State Education Departments
21. Survey of state economies to determine appropriateness of vocational programs being offered?
22. Providing state-of-the-art vocational equipment
23. Coordination with local businesses
24. Cooperation between vocational and special education
25. Cooperation with unions and apprenticeship programs
26. Bilingual education
   a. appropriate staff that can teach content at the same time as english is taught
   b. guidelines for teacher/student ratio
   c. lack of good faith effort guidelines
*27. JTPA - corrections must be allowed to participate - discretion should not be up to the states
*28. Federal Adult Basic Education Act - need a set-aside for corrections

C. Solutions to Impediments

1. Lack of resource coordination
   a. strengthen lobby effort
   b. effort to bring C.E. and SEA together
   c. training efforts of CE in resource availability
2. Explore non-traditional models, not old tired public school models - population is transitory, we must research new ideas related to our populations
3. Exchange between public schools and corrections to increase awareness
4. Create a coordinated Federal program of funding
5. Networking and Dissemination
   a. increase state and federal newsletters
   b. job exchange of correctional professionals - interstate and intrastate
   c. increase volunteerism
   d. exchange with SEA, LEA, IHE who have corrections experience
   e. develop model grant proposals which may be used with modification at various sites
6. P.L. 94-142 - determine if guidelines, regulations or law, response is determined by this
   a. surrogate parents - use volunteer organizations, train them so that they become surrogates and can function as surrogates
7. Identification and assessment - no solution
8. Modify political and educational philosophy, goals to be more palitable to current resources and political climate
9. Exceptions to Chapter #1 for 21 year olds - change from up to 21 to through 21 so that they won't be cut off - this is consistent with P.L. 94-142
10. Annual Parental meeting: SEA and Federal government should negotiate what is acceptable
11. Sustained gains - should not apply - field needs to write during comment period which is now
12. bilingual - teach content not ESL
13. Identify
    a. characteristics of populations
    b. models that would be effective
    c. competencies which teachers need
14. U.S. Department of Education should mandate that SEA and State Department of Corrections work together on specific goals
15. State and federal interagency linkages
16. Corrections should be involved in JTPA

The 1984

Correctional Education Forum

Analysis of Questionaires Report

Preface

The 1984 Correctional Education Forum was held from October 21, 1984, to October 23, 1984. As part of the activities of that gathering, a questionaire, sponsored by the Correctional Education Association, was distributed to those who attended the Forum. The purpose of the questionaire was to gather information from Forum participants, including the representatives of the eight participating States. This summary evaluation report is derived from data contained in 34 questionaires that were returned by the Forum participants. Since approximately 120 questionaires were distributed, the return rate is about 28 percent.

The questionaire consisted of five sections that requested information on: (1) the effectiveness of the Forum presentations; (2) organizational and logistical concerns; (3) recommendations for the National Conference; (4) institutional and participant information and (5) nature of participating agency's Correctional Education program.

This evaluation report consists of brief summaries and illustrations, i.e., tables analyzing the results of each individual question. Furthermore, a summary will appear at the end of the report.

I. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE FORUM PRESENTATIONS

Effectiveness of Presentations and Sessions

The participants were asked to evaluate the panels that were presented by the Department of Education, Correctional Educators, and Professional organizations using the following rating scale: Excellent; Very Good; Good; Fair; and Poor. As illustrated in Table 1, all of the participants rated the panels favorably (even those who indicated a rating of "Fair" were regarded as making a judgement that, while improvements might have been desirable, benefits were derived from participation in the panels). The portions of those panels in which information was shared on the Department of Education's activities and that of Correctional Educators received more "Excellent" responses than did the panel segments that focused on the Professional Organizations. None of the participants felt that the panels were presented "Poorly." There were, however, three participants who stated that this particular question did not apply to them.

Table 1

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Panel on Department of Education Activities	11	11	8	1	0	31
Panel of Correctional Educators	9	10	10	1	0	30
Panel of Professional Organizations	6	11	7	4	0	28

Most Important Ideas That Were Obtained from the Forum

In Section I, Part 8, the participants were asked to list three important ideas that they had obtained from the Forum. Of the 34 participants who completed the questionaire, 27 listed ideas they thought were important. In all, a total of 65 ideas were submitted. Because of the number and diversity of the responses in this area, only those most frequently listed or those which represent recurring themes are presented below:

1. The need for a better Correctional Education Network.

2. The need for establishment of better communication links between Correctional Education agencies and the Department of Education.

3. The need for the U.S. Department of Education to become fully aware of the needs of Correctional Education agencies.

4. The need for more involvement and active participation of regional laboratories and centers by the National Institute of Education.

5. The need for increased cohesiveness and a heightened sense of unity of purpose among employees from different State agencies regarding Correctional Education.

Major Weaknesses of the Forum

The participants provided feedback on the major weaknesses of the Forum. Of the participants who answered this question, seven respondents felt that a major drawback which detracted from the total effectiveness of the Forum was the absence of "top U.S. Department of Education employees." The individuals who commented on this point stated that some of the Federal employees who did attend left "too soon." These individuals also felt that there was "little interaction" with other participants. In addition, some of the participants stated that there was not enough time to cover all of the issues discussed during the Forum. Others felt that the "scheduling of the panels on the first day was unwise." Furthermore, a number of the participants felt that the lectures and verbal presentations were too long. Another group thought that the groups were too large. Their recommendations regarding the "scheduling of the panels on the first day" was to reduce the number of panels on the first day and to begin the Forum with "small group activities." Only a few of the participants felt that the panelists showed lack of knowledge in their topics.

Most Interesting Aspects of the Presentations

The aspect of the presentations that was most interesting and helpful to the participants were the group/work sessions. Almost half of the respondents stated that during the work sessions they had the opportunity to interact with Federal and other State employees. In addition, the aspects of the presentation that were also of most interest to the participants and potentially most useful to their agency or organization were those segments in which the Department of Education staff described their programs and how those program services could be utilized by Correctional Educators. Many participants stated that the panels were "informative in nature."

Finally, some 15 percent of the participants stated that the opportunity to interact with other Forum participants was probably the most helpful and useful feature of the Forum for them.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL AND LOGISTICAL CONCERNS

Additional Aspects of the Forum

The participants were asked to rate (i.e., Excellent; Very Good; Good; Fair; and Poor) the hotel accommodations, meals, Forum planning and presentation materials. As illustrated in Table 2, most of the participants gave favorable ratings. Nearly half of the respondents rated the Forum planning activities by the Department of Education as "Excellent."

Table 2

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Hotel Accommodations	6	8	10	3	0	27
Meals	11	8	10	3	0	32
Department of Education Forum Planning	14	13	3	1	0	31
Presentation Materials, Graphics, etc.	2	13	12	3	0	30

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Subject Areas for the National Conference

In Section III, the participants were asked to provide recommendations regarding the structure and content of the National Conference. The first part of this section requested opinions from the participants concerning which subject areas they thought should be emphasized at the National Conference. The participants were then asked to rank the subject areas in order of priority. As Table 3 indicates, seven people recommended that Vocational Education was the most important subject area (rank priority value of 1) that should be emphasized in the National Conference.[1]

As illustrated in Table 3 Vocational Education received the most responses. Of the 34 participants, 24 recommended that Vocational Education should be emphasized followed by Adult Education (22 responses), Special Education (22 responses), Bilingual Education (21 responses), and Adult Literacy Initiative (21 responses), respectively. Special Populations and Compensatory Education each received 19 responses. In addition, some participants recommended that correctional family involvement initiative and "continuing educators lifelong learning" should also be emphasized during the National Conference.

---

[1] It appears that more than half of the participants may not have understood the instructions for this question. For example, some of the participants rated all the subject areas or thought all areas should be addressed, some of the participants rated only some of the subject areas, while others placed a "check mark."

Table 3

Recommendation for National Conference:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total Responses
Vocational Education	7	5	3	6	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	24
Adult Education	6	1	2	3	4	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	22
Bilingual Education	2	2	1	2	8	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	21
Special Education	5	2	4	3	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	22
Compensatory Education	2	3	0	2	3	1	3	3	0	1	1	0	19
Other Elementary and Secondary (Specify)	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	8
Postsecondary Education	0	3	0	0	1	3	1	1	1	2	0	1	13
Rehabilitation Services	2	1	1	1	4	1	0	3	1	0	1	1	16
Adult Literacy Initiative	5	2	3	2	1	1	2	3	1	0	1	0	21
Special Populations	3	3	4	2	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	18
Minorities	2	2	2	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	11
Women	3	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Youth	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Handicapped/Learning Disabled	2	2	3	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	11
Life Skills/Social Skills	6	1	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	17
Other	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Additional Issues and Concerns for National Conference

The participants were also asked which additional issues and concerns should be emphasized at the Conference. There also appeared to be some confusion concerning the instructions on this part of the form. That is, some participants ranked ordered the four issues and concerns while others placed a "check mark" on only some of the issues. Therefore, to determine which additional issues and concerns should be emphasized, the responses for each issue and concern were tallied and a total number of responses was derived. As illustrated in Table 4, participants felt that the main emphasis should be placed on Interagency Cooperation (30 responses) followed by Funding Sources (28 responses), New Information Technologies (21 responses), and Coordination with Prison Industries (19 responses). Some participants commented on other additional issues and concerns such as a Federal legislative agenda, regulatory reforms, establishing the purpose of Correctional Education and administrative and instructional strategies.

Table 4

Additional Issues and Concerns

Issues and Concerns	Total Responses
Interagency Cooperation	30
Funding Sources	28
New Information Technologies	21
Coordination with Prison Industries	19

Key Resource Persons or Organizations

The last part of Section III asked the participants to list any key resource persons or organizations that should be invited to participate in the National Conference. The respondents expressed a high interest in inviting high ranking Federal and State officials. In the listings which follow, key resource persons, organizations/associations and Federal and State Agencies will be used to categorize the specific comments. For example, under Category I (key resource persons), many participants thought that the Secretary of Education should participate in the National Conference. Because of the diversity of the comments an analysis of the responses on this question was difficult to assess. Therefore, none of the categories and/or specific agency recommendations (e.g., U.S. Department of Labor) should be seen as being more important than the others.

Category I

Key Resource Person

The Secretary of Education

Members of Congress

Congressional Staff

Representatives of Probation and Parole Boards

Correctional Educators

Criminal Justice Scholars

Jail and Prison Systems Instructor

Category II

Associations, Organizations, and Schools

Michigan Association of Juvenile Detention Centers

University Schools of Criminal Justice

National Center for Research in Vocational Education

National Education Association

American Council on Education

Category III

Federal and State Agencies

U.S. Department of Labor

U.S. Department of Health and Human Resources

U.S. Department of Justice

Texas Department of Corrections

IV. INSTITUTIONAL AND PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

Type of Agency Participants Represent

In Section IV, participants provided information on the types of agencies they represented. They were asked to check as many agencies (i.e., Correctional Education, Federal, State, and Private/Professional Organizations) as appropriate for their positions. The majority of the participants were from Federal and State agencies. As illustrated in Table 5A, the Department of Education (13 responses), was the most represented Federal agency. As displayed in Table 5B, most of the State agencies were equally represented with the exceptions of Chapter 2, Block Grant (2 responses), Rehabilitation Services (1 response) and Adult Education (2 responses). Incidentally, two participants noted that the Adult Education Agency did not appear on the list. The Correctional Education agencies (Table 5C) had a few representatives from Youth Corrections (6 responses) and State Adult Corrections (5 responses). A total of six participants represented Private and Professional Organizations (e.g., Correctional Education Association).

Table 5-A
Correctional Education Agencies

Agency	Numer of Participants
State and Adult Corrections	5
Federal Corrections	2
Jails	0
Youth Corrections	6

Table 5-B

Federal Agency	Number of Participants
Labor	0
Justice	1
National Institute of Corrections	0
Education	13

Table 5-C

State Agency	Number of Participants
Special Education	5
Vocational Education	5
Compensatory Education/Chapter 1	6
Chapter 2 Block Grant	2
Correctional Education	7
Postsecondary Education	5
Bilingual Education	3
Adult Education	2
Rehabilitation Services	1

Table 5-D

Private and Professional Organizations	Number of Participants
Professional Organization	4
Institution of Higher Education	1
Private Organization or Interest Group	1
Other	0

* Please note that these tables reflect only those participants who completed the evaluation form and does not indicate the openness of all of those who participated in the Forum.

Job Related Information

The last portions of Section IV of the questionaire ask the participants for their specific job title, length of time in position, and level of education. The participants were also asked if their jobs currently involved Correctional Education and if so, what percentage of their time was being devoted to Correctional Education activities. Most of the respondents were either Education Program Specialists or Directors of a program. There were a few Education Consultants, Administrators, and Assistants to Directors. More than 50 percent (21 out of 34) of the respondents said they have been in their current job for five years or less. Furthermore, over 50 percent of the respondents had at least a Master's Degree (21 responses). Over 70 percent of them said their job involved Correctional Education. Moreover, one-third of the respondents devoted less than 25 percent of their time to Correctional Education activities. However, more than one-third of the respondents devoted over 50 percent of their time to Correctional Education activities.

V. NATURE OF PARTICIPATING AGENCY'S CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Purpose of Correctional Education Program

Section V of the questionnaire was concerned with the nature of the participating agency's Correctional Education program. The participants were asked to answer the questions, only if they were directly involved in the administration of Correctional Education programs. Approximately half of the participants said they were involved in the administration of Correctional Education programs.

Most of the participants who said they were involved stated that the "main" purpose of Correctional Education programs was to educate inmates, youths and children so that they could "become functional and responsible citizens."

The participants were also asked what types of Correctional Education programs were provided by their State. All of the 17 participants who answered this section said their State provided Vocational and Compensatory/Chapter 1 programs. Special Education and Secondary/G.E.D. were also among the programs provided by their State. Only two participants indicated the availability at both the adult and juvenile levels.

Outside Office/Division and Funding Sources

The last portion of the questionnaire asked the participants which agencies from outside their office/division participate in Correctional Education programs and what funding sources are being used to support the Correctional Education programs in their State.

More than half the participants stated that Universities/Colleges, Business/Industry, Volunteer Groups and other State agencies participated in Correctional Education programs in their State. Furthermore, over 50 percent of the participants stated that their funding sources are being derived from Federal and State correction funds.

SUMMARY

Any effort to summarize the evaluation/questionaire would be difficult because of the small number of respondents. However, there are general conclusions which can be drawn from a review of these questionaire responses.

First of all, over 50 percent of the participants who returned the questionaire felt that the overall effectiveness of the Forum was "Very Good." The main problems that participants commented on were the scheduling of the panels and the need for more interaction between participants.

Most of the respondents stated that Vocational Education, Adult Education, Special Education, Bilingual Education, Interagency Cooperation and Funding resources should be emphasized at the National Conference. They would also like to see more Federal and State government officials attend and participate in the National Conference.

Of the participants who completed the questionaire, over 50 percent of them stated that their jobs involved Correctional Education. Furthermore, most of the participants stated that they devote more than 50 percent of their time to Correctional Education activities. Most of the participants were educated at the postgraduate level. Some 21 respondents indicated they held a Masters or Doctorate and ten indicated they held a JD/LLB.

Finally, regarding the nature of participating agency's Correctional Education programs, 50 percent of the participants stated that they were directly involved in the administration of these programs. Most of the funding sources used to support Correctional Education programs in the participants' States are derived from Federal programs.

Correctional Education

Forum

Participants:

Department of Education

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM PARTICIPANTS

Office of Educational Research and Improvement

National Institute of Education

Ronald Bucknam
Ollie Moles
Phil Whiteman
Allen Wilson

CLEI

Jim Aven
Fred Decker
Ann Erdman
Linda Jones
Janice Mosher
Trish Skaptason

Office of Adult Literacy

Joe Casello
Diane Vines
Pontheolla Williams

Office of Postsecondary Education

Benjamin Alexander
Brian Kerrigan
Jowava Leggett
Carol Smith
Joseph A. Vignone
William Young

Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Charlotte Conaway
Bill Langner
John Nealon
Duane Nielsen
James T. Parker
Nancy Smith
Isaac Wilder
Robert Worthington
John Wu

Corrections Program

Dianne Carter
Tim Halnon
Bernard O'Hayre

Office of Bilingual and Minority Affairs

Mary Britt
Gil Chavez
Rudy Cordova
Norma Garcia
Mary Mahony
Rudy Munis
Ramon Ruiz
Cindy Ryan

Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation

Keith Baker
Sue Betka
Tom Corwin
Fran-Marie Kennedy-Keel
Gail Upton

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Joseph Clair
Wendy Cullar
Lonnie Stewart
Doris Sutherland
Bob Walling
Ed Wilson

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Ron Davis
Jim Evans
Cecillia Frantz
Dolores Hartman
David Maginnes
Pat Mancini
Marge Thompson

Regional Liaison Unit

Gil Sailor - Realty Officer

Other Participants

Richard LaPointe
Andrew Patterson

CORRECTIONS EDUCATION FORUM

Participants:

State Representatives

Professional Organizations

Private Sector

Correctional Education Forum Participants

Alan L. Alcon
Director of Program Development
New York State Division for Youth
84 Holland Avenue
Albany, New York 12228

Clyde Arnspiger
Director of Education
Department of Offender Rehabilitation
#2 Martin Luther King Drive
Twin Towers East #654
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Jean Campbell
Education Consultant School
 Social Services
Bureau of Student Services
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, Connecticut 06145

Dave Carnahan
Educational Administrator
Office of Program Development
Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 9699
Olympia, Washington 98504

Mariam S. Charnow
MESA Corporation
118000 Sunrise Valley Drive
Reston, Virginia 22090

Barbara S. Clankscales
Education Coordinator
DHR - Division of Youth Service
878 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Ray Cleere
Vice Chancellor
University System Board of Regents
244 Washington Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Osa Coffey
Executive Director
Correctional Education Association
1400 20th Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036

Glenn Davison
Assistant State Director
Wisconsin Board of Vocational
and Technical Education
4802 Sheboygan Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

William Ernst
Consultant, Chapter I
Department of Public Instruction
125 S. Webster
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Gary Eyre
Executive Director
AAACE
Washington, D.C.

Murry Gregg
State Director and President
J.F. Ingram State Technical College
Box 209
Deatsville, Alabama 36022

Dick Ford
Director, Jail Operations
NSA
Alexandria, Virginia

Robert Hable
Assistant Director
Career Services
Wisconsin Division of Corrections
1 West Wilson Street, Room 1120
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Ida Halasz
Project Director
National Corrections Education
Consortium
National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43214

Beret Harmon
State Director, Adult Education
Old Capitol Building FG-11
Olympia, Washington 98504

Cynthia B. Heine
Director of Training
Unified Industries Inc.
6551 Loisdale CT, Suite 400
Springfield, Virginia 22150

Stan Karez
Director
Center for the Study of Correctional
 Education
University of Wisconsin - Stout
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

Beverly J. Kochan
Supervisor
Public and Private Agency Programs
Division for Handicapped Children
 and Pupil Services
Department of Public Instruction
125 S. Webster
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

Daisy L. Lee
Classification Counselor
Arlington Sheriff's Office
1400 N. Courthouse Road
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Victor Levy
Budget-Planning Consultant
Office of Vocational Education
1776 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Dr. Paul Liberty
Director
EDAC, Lesley College
49 Washington Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140

John Linton
Director of Correctional Education
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Merritt D. Long
Administrator
Commission for Vocational Education
Building #17 - Mail Stop #10
Olympia, Washington 98502

Al Lynch
Supervisor of Institutional Programs
Old Capitol Building FG-11
Olympia, Washington 98504

Sylvia G. McCollum
Education Administrator
Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Jim McEwen
Director
Instructional and State Services
Postsecondary Department
419 So. Perry Street
Montgomery, Alabama

Bill McKnight
Classification Counselor
Arlington Sheriff's Office
1400 N. Courthouse Road
Arlington, Virginia 22201

William G. McMahon
Chairman
Commission of Correction
60 South Pearl Street
Albany, New York 12207

Henry L. McQueen
Special Education Administrator
DSS/OCYS/ISD
300 S. Capital Avenue
Commerce Center Building
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Mae Mittag
Adult Education Consultant
Adult Extended Learning Service
Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Garrett W. Murphy
Director
Division of Adult and Continuing
 Education Programs
New York State Education Department
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12234

Lane Murray
Superintendent of Schools
Windham Texas Department of
Corrections
Box 40
Huntsville, Texas 77340

Charlotte A. Nesbitt
Project Director
American Correctional Association
4321 Hartwick Road
Suite L-208
College Park, Maryland 20740

Andrew Patterson, Jr.
Fiscal Program Specialist II
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, Texas 75701

John Platt
Professor
West Virginia University
Morgantown, Virginia 26506

Petrita Hernandez Rojas
Director of Education
New York State Department of Corrections
Campus Building #2, Room 315
Albany, New York 02226

Miguil Ruiz
Chief
Bilingual and Migrant Education
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48901

T.A. Ryan
Professor
Route 1, Box 23
Lexington, South Carolina 29072

Thomas F. Shea
Director, Control Data
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 370
Washington, D.C. 20004

Edward S. Shia
Education Consultant and Liaison
with Correction
State Department of Education
State Office Building, P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, Connecticut

Randy Shipe
Director, Region II CEA
P.O. Box 4731
Charlotteville, Virginia 22905

Rebecca S. Smith
Chief of Educational Services
Department of Correction
Building 4, Room 300
112 California Avenue
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Diane Spence
Director of Education
Department of Corrections
3222 S. Logan
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Hy Steinberg
Chief of Educational Services
Texas Youth Commission
8900 Shoal Creek Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78731

Paul Steiner
Social Science Analyst
Office of Juvenile Justice and Drug
Prevention
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

Steven Steurer
National Institute of Correction
Washington, D.C.

John Stewart
Superintendent of Education
Alabama Department of Youth
Services
P.O. Box 66
Mt. Meiggs, Alabama 36057

Robert P. Suerken
Superintendent of Schools
Department of Children and Youth
Services
170 Sigourney Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06105

Steven L. Swisher
Correctional Academic Specialist
Maryland State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland

Robert Thornton
Administrator
Program Support Services
Division of Juvenile Rehabilitation
OB-32
Olympia, Washington 98504

Raymond Vitelli
Superintendent of Schools
Department of Correction
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Bob Walden
State Director of Adult Education
State Department of Education
3858 Antoinette Drive
Montgomery, Alabama 36111

Bill Wienke
Professor
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Deborah Wysinger
Social Science Program Specialist
National Institute for Juvenile
Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Michael T. York
Education Consultant
Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48902

APPENDICES

STATE DIRECTORS' REPORTS

ON

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION ISSUES AND CONCERNS

October, 1984

AN ALABAMA PERSPECTIVE ON CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION: ISSUES AND INITIATIVES

MURRY C. GREGG, ED. D.
PRESIDENT
J. F. INGRAM STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Deatsville, Alabama 36022

October, 1984

112

INTRODUCTION

Correctional Education in Alabama is conducted by four two-year colleges administered by the Department of Postsecondary Education under the control of the Alabama State Board of Education sitting as trustee for the two-year college system. Two junior colleges conduct college classes and two technical colleges conduct basic education and technical education classes. The largest of these institutions is J. F. Ingram State Technical College with an enrollment of over 1,300 students from nine major adult correctional institutions.

Because the control and funding for all Correctional Education in Alabama is through the State Board of Education and the two-year college system, cooperation with the Department of Corrections is a must.

This organization for funding and operation has achieved great success. Herein are issues and concerns from the Alabama perspective.

The Alabama Prison System, although often the focus of national attention, sometimes deserved and sometimes not, has during this past decade concurrently produced the evolution of an almost unique Correctional Education system. This writer welcomes the opportunity to clarify certain issues and, from long experience, propose a few initiatives.

First, overpopulation and the rapid rise projected in the Alabama prison population produced the Federal Court Order addressing this issue as well as an increasingly critical need for Correctional Education. This trend will continue into the future impacting particularly on funding. The present Correctional Education system, nationally recognized for excellence, is part of the State Department of Postsecondary Education system, therefore, almost totally dependent on state funds and competing with other state educational agencies for available resources. The inevitability of this problem is becoming more and more disconcerting. Federal funds could prevent weakening of the current Correctional Education effort.

It should be noted that although the administrative separation of corrections and education that exists in Alabama does present certain problems, it also provides opportunities. As Dr. Sherman Day, a former Director of the National Institute of Corrections, observed after touring J. F. Ingram State Technical College, and also attested to before an Alabama statewide prison education task force, this situtation is really a blessing and a model which should be adopted by other states. It is unique. Only a handful of other states enjoy anything even close, in legal status, to the educational benefits this allows. However, the funding problem remains.

Dr. Robert Worthington cited Ingram State as an example of good cooperation between corrections and education in a major address to the 3rd Annual Meeting of State Directors of Correctional Education in July of 1984. This cooperation is, of course, necessary in part because of the separate administrations. However, federal assistance should be made available directly to the Correctional Education agencies and schools involved because, despite the high degree of cooperation cited, correctional administration must necessarily have a different set of priorities. Unfortunately, student needs can often lose out to more barbed wire and guard towers. This is understandable but counterproductive to Correctional Education goals. Federal officials, and particularly Secretary Bell, must be aware of this important distinction whenever allocation of funds is considered. Also, even the monies available now are restricted in their application (e.g. to certain age groups) and produce inadequate results even when properly managed. To help reduce these kinds of problems, part of the Secretary of Education's discretionary funds could be channelled directly into Correctional Education programs through state education agencies.

Next, while still addressing federal funding in relation to Alabama's Correctional Education needs, I suggest, perhaps on a fifty-fifty matching basis, that monies available be earmarked for library and media centers for all major Alabama Correctional Education programs. In addition, capital outlay funds should be made available to bring, whenever needed, the Correctional Education facilities "out of the prison's backrooms" into reasonable environments for learning and the self-identification of inmates as "students," that is, people "in the process of change."

Whenever we have been able to do this in Alabama, our programs have improved dramatically; the motivation and energy levels of our students also demonstrate this principle. Unfortunately, no single institution can always fully fund in their budgets such expensive items which could really have the impact envisioned by ths proposal.

On another level, I would like to see created in Alabama both an Intra-Departmental Coordinating Committee on Correctional Education using the federal model, and a state-level education department (within the current structure) of Correctional Education with its own Director. This level of effort would produce more activity, accountability, as well as a central coordinating point for the many separate efforts now underway. It is hoped that Secretary Bell will encourage states in this direction.

Another proposal that would be extremely helpful to the correctional educators in the field, would be a national "drive for excellence" in Correctional Education. Reports and documents produced by such an effort would be very influential and have statewide impact in Alabama. A federal initiative will be necessary to effect this needed emphasis. The general public does not realize that despite increasingly severe sentences, ninety-five percent (95%) of all offenders eventually are released.

Finally, and to some, most ambitiously, I would like to propose that identification of problems may have already been done well enough to begin implementation modeling. In Alabama, our unique legal position, our nationally recognized Ingram State Technical College Correctional Education program, and several other key factors, leads me to believe that such an implementation model could and should be established using these opportunities and the existing Ingram program as the foundation. Perhaps, even only a fifty-fifty matching application of federal discretionary funds could produce easily a model for demonstrating what we do know in this field of Correctional Education, and what we can produce given adequate facilities, leadership, and opportunity.

Key people in the present administration, including Dr. Robert Worthington and Mr. Bernard O'Hayre, have already visited our Ingram facilities and are aware of what can be done even with limited state funds. The additions to our program since their visits (including a $20,000 video lab grant from NIC, a sophisticated computer curriculum delivery lab, etc.) only serve to strengthen the probability that with enough federal funds to fully implement a model program, and with the coordination of visitations by those in positions of change and leadership in other states (via the networking capability of the Intra-Departmental Committee), that role modeling of significant impact would occur. Again, implementation of what we do know is becoming as important as simply listing and discussing our problems. Most of our Correctional Education problems are all too familiar; success stories and working/teaching role models are what we need.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENT

for

THE CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM

WASHINGTON D.C.

OCTOBER 21-23, 1984

by

John C. Stewart

Superintendent

Youth Services District

Alabama

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENT
for
THE CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FORUM
WASHINGTON D.C.
OCTOBER 21-23, 1984

I. Issues:

Correctional education offers the offender population a last chance to bring some order to what otherwise has generally been a misguided and nonproductive educational experience. This system which can provide order is without structure or unity. The delievery of service to these students vary as greatly as the number of states one reviews.

Public Law 94-142 provides various categories of special education services for these youths. Yet, the number of reported handicapped students will vary among states. Therefore, an issue to be raised is the non-categorical labelling of all special education students or the provision for categorical labeling of correctional students.

Recently the nation has witnessed the gowth of attention given to the correctional education process. This has been accomplished primarily by recognition of exemplary programs that focus on the adult population. However, there are strides being made in the area of education for the youthful offender. Increased emphasis on educational experiences for the juveniles should result in a lower return of the population to any correctional facility.

Other issues:

A. Good communication is needed between public service agencies.

B. Clear definition of teacher certification for those educators in the correction field.

C. The influence of the home community upon the returning student.

II. Concerns.

One of the major concerns prevelant in the area of correctional education is the lack of unity. Standards are not provided, education is a second thought, and territorialism is rampant.

A second concern I have is the many inappropriate guidelines, both federal and state, that correction education has to adhere to. They provide the means to receive funding, but lack the clear definition for the offender population.

Other concerns:

A. In many systems the educational administrator's role lacks definition.

b. The lack of awareness for correctional education among the general educational community.

III. Remedial Action:

The first action to be recommended would be to have clarity and unity of definition for correctional education. This should encompass both the juvenile and adult population.

Secondly, funding for the educational programs needs to have more consideration. This is an unique population of students and per pupil expenditures are high.

Thirdly, the identification of students abilities needs to be a priority so that education programs can be developed. Taken seriously this could provide a national network of programming that would offer easy access to the educator writing individual plans for the students.

Finally, the most important remedial action to be considered at this point is the continued dialogue among correctional educators. Improved relations with state departments of education will compliment the professionals in our field. Therefore, we must present our programs, make friends of other agencies, and continue to offer good educational experiences for the students.

STATE DIRECTORS REPORT

Juvenile Corrections

Dr. Robert Suerken

Connecticut

ROBERT P. SUERKEN
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Special Needs Working Session

A. Identify client characteristics and the specialized educational needs of the offender population including remedial programs (Special Education and Chapter 1), bilingual education, education in segregation, and equality for female offenders.

The most outstanding need of clients is comprehensive special education services. Systems for diagnosis, referral, prescription, instruction and evaluation. In addition, transitional services that focus on communication with parents, public school personnel and other community agencies are essential to a juvenile justice system characterized by short term institutionalization and age groupings that not only recommend, but often mandate the continuation of formalized education. Ninety (90%) of the juveniles residing in Connecticut's juvenile facility are diagnosed as educationally handicapped. The average length of stay is six (6) months. The median age is 15.4.

B. Identify the impediments to the provision and delivery of educational services as perceived by the Department of Education, the Corrections field, and other federal agency and professional organizational personnel.

The requirements of the regulations promulgated under Public Law 94-142 impede the delivery of special education services in that regulatory requirements infringe upon and detract from, the quantity and quality of direct services available to educationally handicapped juveniles by pre-empting resources.

The ambiguity/elasticity of the regulations have been a catylist for litigation. Most of the litigation focuses on a series of unsuccessful attempts to invoke these education regulations to justify an alternative placement or to preclude a placement in the juvenile justice system.

C. Recommend modifications and innovations for removal of impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

The aforementined impediments can not be removed or modified without significantly reducing the individual rights of handicapped children as delineated in the P.L. 94-142 regulations. The most significant clarification came about in a Memorandum of Agreement with the Office of Civil Rights, U. S. Department of Education, in June of 1983 (see attached).

D. For the 1985 National Conference recommend major topics, program format, participants, and theme.

Topics:

I. Organization design for Correctional Education Systems
  A. An examination of typical state models.
    1. The Dept. of Correction or Youth Services Model
    2. The School District Model
    3. The State Education Agency Model

II. The development of Correctional Education Standards re:
  A. Personnel
    1. qualifications
    2. training and staff development
    3. performance criteria and evaluation
    4. staffing patterns
  B. Program
    1. Minimum policy and procedure for:
      a. curriculum
      b. special education
      c. prevocational and vocational education
      d. hours of instruction
      e. homework
      f. student access
      etc. etc. etc.

C. Recommend modifications and innovations for removal of impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

The aforementined impediments can not be removed or modified without significantly reducing the individual rights of handicapped children as delineated in the P.L. 94-142 regulations. The most significant clarification came about in a Memorandum of Agreement with the Office of Civil Rights, U. S. Department of Education, in June of 1983 (see attached).

D. For the 1985 National Conference recommend major topics, program format, participants, and theme.

Topics:

I. Organization design for Correctional Education Systems
    A. An examination of typical state models.
        1. The Dept. of Correction or Youth Services Model
        2. The School District Model
        3. The State Education Agency Model

II. The development of Correctional Education Standards re:
    A. Personnel
        1. qualifications
        2. training and staff development
        3. performance criteria and evaluation
        4. staffing patterns
    B. Program
        1. Minimum policy and procedure for:
            a. curriculum
            b. special education
            c. prevocational and vocational education
            d. hours of instruction
            e. homework
            f. student access
            etc. etc. etc.

ROBERT P. SUERKEN
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

General Education Issues in Corrections

Working Session

A. Identify client characteristics and the general educational issues of the offender population including vocational education, adult and postsecondary education, literacy, basic education, and other issues of general concern.

The most significant client characteristics are: behavior that seriously impairs the learning process; lack of communication skills (particularly verbal skills) and a lack of fundamental computational skills.

B. Identify the impediments to the provision and delivery of educational services as perceived by the Department of Education, the Corrections field, and other federal agency and professional organizational personnel.

No other impediments other than those mentioned in part B of the A.M. format.

C. Recommend modifications and innovations for removal of impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

Same as Part C of the A.M. format

D. For the 1985 National Conference recommend major topics, program format, participants, and theme.

Topics:

Same as Part D of the A.M. format

C. Recommend modifications and innovations for removal of impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

Same as Part C of the A.M. format

D. For the 1985 National Conference recommend major topics, program format, participants, and theme.

Topics:

Same as Part D of the A.M. format

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

To ensure that each handicapped child in its jurisdiction is provided a free appropriate public education in accordance with the requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794, (Section 504) and its implementing regulations at 34 C.F.R. Part 104, the State of Connecticut agrees that it will apply and insure the application of the following principles in determining financial responsibility for certain residential placements:

1. With reference to an LEA's obligations under Section 504 when it makes or refers a handicapped child to a placement, it is agreed that:

(a) Under Section 504, it is conclusively presumed that when an LEA "places or refers" a handicapped child to a program other than its own, including a residential program, it has done so exclusively as "its means of carrying out the requirements" to provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE). [34 C.F.R. § 104.33(b)(3)]. The SEA will act to insure that LEAs accept complete financial responsibility for the cost (including room and board) of placements they have made and that they not refuse to accept this responsibility on the grounds that such placements were made for some reason other than to provide FAPE.

2. With reference to an LEA's obligations under Section 504 when a placement is made by a parent or guardian, it is agreed that:

(a) Once an LEA has made an "appropriate" education available to a handicapped child, it has no financial responsibility, under Federal law, for any placement unilaterally secured by a parent or guardian [34 C.F.R. § 104.33(c)(4)]. A program is "appropriate" if it has been developed and provided in accordance with the requirements of § 104.33 of the Section 504 regulation, and is reasonably calculated to provide an education from which the handicapped child can derive a benefit.

(b) Section 504 permits parents to challenge the appropriateness of the placement made available by the LEA by using the procedural safeguards set forth at § 104.36. Where parents use such procedures and it is found that the LEA did not make an appropriate placement available, the LEA becomes financially responsible for all costs of the educational program ordered by the deciding official which may include the entire cost of the program secured by the parent, including room and board.

(c) A program can be "appropriate" even though it might be shown that another placement provides more or better services of the kind needed by the handicapped child. For the purposes of Section 504, the issue is not which program is "better," but whether the program made available by the LEA meets the standard of § 104.33 of the Section 504 regulations

(d) Where an LEA has made an appropriate education available to a handicapped child, and the parents place their child in a hospital because of the child's need for medical services such as surgery or chemotherapy for the treatment of disease, Section 504 does not require any educational agency to pay the cost of room and board.

(e) Connecticut State law does not consider a handicapped child placed in a residential facility by the Department of Mental Retardation (DMR) or Department of Children and Youth Service (DCYS) to have been placed to receive "educational" services. However, while the child resides at any such facility, it is the responsibility of the Special School District to ensure that the child receives appropriate special educational and related services in conformity with 34 C.F.R. § 104.54 [Education of Institutionalized Persons].

(f) Notwithstanding paragraph 2(e), within 60 days of the admission of a handicapped child to any DMR facility, a Planning and Placement Team (PPT) meeting will be convened. The PPT will act in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 104.35 [Evaluation and Placement] and determine whether a residential placement itself is necessary to provide the handicapped child with an appropriate education. If so, then the program, including the full cost of nonmedical care and room and board shall be provided at no cost to the person or to his or her parents or guardians. Apportionment, between the relevant public agencies (including the LEA), of the financial responsibility for providing that education, including room and board, is a matter which is governed by State law and practice. An administrative decision to transfer or discharge such handicapped child shall be made pursuant to State due process procedures and shall include consideration of the appropriateness of the educational program to be provided in the proposed placement.

(g) Where the PPT determines, or it is finally determined after a hearing pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 104.36 [Procedural Safeguards], that the handicapped child did not need a residential placement in a DMR facility in order to receive an appropriate education, then the parents may be assessed fees for room and board at the facility in accordance with State law. Under such circumstances, administrative decisions by State authorities to transfer or discharge the child from such a facility do not constitute a change in educational placement under the regulations implementing Section 504.

(h) Notwithstanding paragraph 2(e), within 60 days of the admission of a handicapped child to any DCYS facility, a Planning and Placement Team (PPT) meeting will be convened. The PPT will act in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 104.35 [Evaluation and Placement] and determine whether a residential placement itself is necessary to provide the handicapped child with an appropriate education. If so, then the program, including the full cost of nonmedical care and room and board shall be provided at no cost to the person or to his or her parents or guardians. Apportionment, between the relevant public agencies (including the LEA), of the financial responsibility for providing that education, including room and board, is a matter which is governed by State law and practice.

(i) Even if the PPT team decides, pursuant to paragraph 2(h) that public agencies shall bear full financial responsibility for the costs of special education, including room and board, while the child is resident at the DCYS facility, subsequent administrative decisions by DCYS to discharge or transfer such child from the facility shall be governed by the prior agreement between DCYS and OCR dated July 27, 1982 and attached as Appendix A.

(j) Where the PPT determines, or it is finally determined after a hearing pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 104.36 [Procedural Safeguards], that the handicapped child did not need a residential placement in a DCYS facility in order to receive an appropriate education, then the parents may be assessed fees for room and board at the facility in accordance with State law. Under such circumstances, administrative decisions by State authorities to transfer or discharge the child from such a facility do not constitute a change in educational placement under the regulations implementing Section 504.

3. With reference to Sections 10-76d(a), 10-76d(d) and (e) of the Connecticut General Statutes, it is agreed that:

(a) The term "requirements for special education" found in § 10-76d(d) shall be interpreted to include the Federal requirements set forth in 34 C.F.R. §§ 104.31-39 and § 104.54, and specifically the requirement that handicapped children be provided with a free appropriate public education contained in § 104.33.

(b) The term "educational services" found in §§ 10-76d(d) and (e) shall be interpreted to include any special educational or related service (i.e., "developmental, corrective and other supportive services") which Federal law requires public agencies to provide handicapped children where appropriate. [*See* 34 C.F.R. §§ 104.33, 104.34, 104.35 and paragraph 23, Appendix A; *See* also 34 C.F.R. § 300.13.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(c) The term "psychiatric or institutional care or services" found in § 10-76d(d) shall not be interpreted to include any special educational service or related service which Federal law requires be provided to any individual handicapped children where appropriate.

(d) The term "related services" found in § 10-76d(a) shall be interpreted to include at least the same developmental, corrective and supportive services required by Federal law and encompassed by 34 C.F.R. § 104.33 [See also 34 C.F.R. § 300.13.]

4. With reference to the circumstances under which psychological and counseling services must be provided to a handicapped child:

(a) The opinion letter by the Attorney General of Connecticut to the Acting Commissioner dated June 22, 1983 (Appendix B), shall upon issuance, be incorporated into this Memorandum of Understanding.

5. With reference to legislative or regulatory action needed to implement provisions of this agreement:

The State shall be afforded a reasonable amount of time within which to accomplish any statutory or regulatory changes required to effectuate any provisions of this agreement. In the interim, the SEA shall ensure that no parent is required to pay for any special education or related service, including room and board, in contravention of this agreement.

The terms and conditions of the forgoing Memorandum of Understanding are agreed to by:

Harry M. Singleton
Assistant Secretary for
Civil Rights
Department of Education
DATE: 6/22/83

Joseph R. Galotti
Acting Commissioner
Connecticut Department of
Education
DATE: 6/22/83

Mark J. Marcus
Commissioner
Connecticut Department of Children
and Youth Services
DATE: 6/22/83

Gareth D. Thorne
Comissioner
Connecticut Department of Mental
Retardation
DATE: 6-22-83

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE DIRECTORS REPORT

Juvenile Corrections

Barbara S. Clankscales
Georgia

Name: Barbara S. Clankscales
Agency: Department of Human Resources
Division of Youth Services
Title: Education Coordinator
State: Georgia

The following comments are offered with the hope that they will be helpful in efforts undertaken to address problematic areas of the delivery system in correction education. The issues discussed are not new, rather, they are issues of longstanding which persist and continue to handicap service delivery in Georgia's juvenile justice system.

Limited Access to Voc Ed Resources

Correction education for youth in Georgia suffers from the lack of a tie-in with existing Voc Ed resources outside the juvenile justice system. In view of the fact that prominence was not given to services for youthful offenders in P.L. 94-482; given the option, Voc Ed institutions generally do not voluntarily include the offender population in their program objectives, and; given that the correction program does not have sufficient staff, time, or advocated to sway favorable consideration from Voc Ed institutions, the correction program has little opportunity to: (1) benefit from support services relative to curriculum and program development; (2) staff training, and; (3) industry's collaboration and partnership arrangements with regular Voc Ed institutions.

Solution

(1) Legislation for vocational education should mandate representation of correctional institutions for juvenile offenders on state and local advisory councils. Provisions should also be made to insure compliance with the mandate. (2) Funds should be set-aside for vocational education program in correctional institutions for juvenile offenders.

P.L. 97-35 - Chapter I

The Chapter I Project is a mainstay in Georgia's program. The service has had a far-reaching impact on improving the overall quality of educational programs in residential facilities throughout the state. Most importantly, the reading and math skills of students who participate in the project consistently improve. Unfortunately, Chapter I funds are restricted to residential facilities with an average length of stay of 30 days or more. The residential requirement, therefore, prevents the utilization of funds in community-based programs, such as alternative school programs. These schools are uniquely designed to meet the academic as well as the emotional and social needs of the student in a structured environment and on an individualized basis. Alternative schools, we feel, are desirable alternatives to institutionalization and should be considered as a first choice for treatment where appropriate. In addition to serving as a means for preventing further penetration into the juvenile justice system, alternative schools provide the opportunity for the youth to maintain ties with the home school, family and significant others in the community.

Solution

Waive the residential requirement for community-based programs such as alternative schools.

P.L. 98-211 - Technical Amendments to the Education Consolidation Act of 1981 - Chapter I

Typical of education legislation written primarily for LEAs with little regard for the differences that exist in correction education, P.L. 98-211 requires that an annual meeting for parents be held to explain the Chapter I program. Because of student turnover and the statewideness of correctional programs, an annual meeting for parents is impractical in a correctional setting. Instead, on-going meetings with parents at the time visits are made to the facilities would better benefit the parents, students and the institution.

P.L. 98-211 - Also requires an evaluation at least once every 3 years. The evaluation must include a determination of whether improved performance resulting from Chapter I participation is sustained over a period of more than one year. A great number of juvenile offenders do not return to an environment, i.e., regular academic school, where tracking and measuring of sustained effect might occur. To the contrary, most offenders return to communities and situations where tracking and measuring is impossible.

Solution

A study should be undertaken to establish practical criteria for evaluating the impact of Chapter I programs in correctional education.

P.L. 94-142

The purpose of P.L. 94-142 was to guarantee every handicapped child between the ages of 3 and 21 a free and appropriate public education. P.L. 94-142 is not adequately implemented in Georgia's corrections for juveniles. A major reason is the shortage of staff. Special education teachers for the programs are provided by LEAs on the basis of the traditional 9-month school year. Correction programs are 12-month programs. Since the program is financially unable to fill the 3-month gap, service to students in the program is disrupted and service for students admitted to the institution during the 3-month break is not available, or, at best, it is available for a shorter length of time than it would have been were it not for the break.

Solution

Establish guidelines that will insure that handicapped youth in correctional settings will have the opportunity to receive special education services whenever they are admitted to the institution.

P.L. 97-35 - Chapter II

Georgia's program has not fully benefitted from the resources provided by Chapter II funds. The reason is that the majority of the LEAs have not made the resource available to correction programs in their districts.

Solution

(1) Include provisions for monitoring administrative agencies to insure that Chapter II funds are made available to correction programs and that they are expended for programs in correctional education, or; (2) Designate the State Agency as the administrative agency with the authority to apply to the State Department of Education for funds. This will eliminate the problem of individual programs being at the mercy of insensitive LEAs. It will also allow the state agency to use the resources where they are most needed.

Job Training Partnership Act of 1983

The purpose of the JTPA was to prepare people with serious employment barriers to be productive members of the labor force. Services for juvenile offenders, one of our most troubled subgroups, are difficult to access. The reasons are that: (1) Private Industry Councils in Georgia appear to be reluctant to consider a state application which has statewide implications and; (2) in accordance with the State Department of Education guidelines, applications for Section 123 funds require approval by PICs. The State Agency has been unable to identify a PIC with a service priority for juvenile offenders. Although it is not written, the message is communicated that in light of the rate of success requirements of the law, juvenile offenders are a bad risk. The denial of services appears to be a violation of the letter and the spirit of the law.

Solution

The magnitude of employment problems specific to juvenile offenders warrants a targeting of a portion of the funds allocated to the state for the development of innovative and comprehensive programs tailored to the unique needs of the juvenile offender population.

STATE DIRECTORS REPORT

Juvenile Corrections

Henry L. McQueen

Michigan

STATE OF MICHIGAN

JAMES J. BLANCHARD, Governor
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
[illegible]
[illegible]

November 6, 1984

Dr. Dianne Carter
U.S. Department of Education
5052 GSA, ROB 3
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Dr. Carter:

Enclosed please find a copy of both Workshop Session reports and a paper titled "A Direction for Correctional Education" representing my input at the National Correctional Education Forum, October 21-24, 1984.

The Travel Unit shall send the reimbursement voucher from their office in a separate mailing.

Thank you for the opportunity to meet and share the concerns of correctional educators in Michigan. Should there be a need for additional assistance please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Henry L. McQueen,
Special Education Administrator
Institutional Services Division

HLM:ms
Enclosure

Special Needs Working Session

A. Identify client characteristics and the specialized educational needs of the offender population including remedial programs (Special Education and Chapter 1), bilingual education, education in segregation, and equality for female offenders.

- Developmental rate 2 to 3 standard deviations below the means
- Shows low on reading and math test
- Impairment of the adaptive and cognitive domain
- Poor interpersonal relationships
- Moody, unhappy or depressive
- Unwarranted fear about school
- Poor articulation including omissions, subtractions and distortions
- Language impairments including sematics, oral and aural language
- Psychological problems related to understanding spoken or written language
- Some brain disorders, i.e., dyslexia and apahsia (Over for remediation)

B. Identify the impediments to the provision and delivery of educational services as perceived by the Department of Education, the Corrections field, and other federal agency and professional organizational personnel.

- Shortage of qualified teaching staff
- Lack of adequate training
- Shortage of qualified support staff
- Inadequate facilities
- Lack of adequate program development and evaluation
- Lack of adequate funding
- Absence of minimum educational standards including:
  - number of hours of instruction per day
  - student-teacher ratio
  - content areas

(Over for continuation)

A. Remediation

- Low student ratio (10-1)
- Certified teachers in the following areas:
  - Emotionally impaired
  - Mentally impaired
  - Speech and language impaired
  - Autism
- Learning disabilities program
- Related services support program
  - Curriculum specialist
  - Monitoring and compliance coordination
  - Teacher and staff training
  - Teacher consultants
  - School psychologist
- Individualization of instruction including,
  - The development of individualized goals, and objectives.

B. Impediments

- Existing federal programs requirements include applying for funds through the Department of Education (DOE). These departments in most cases, are public school oriented and do not provide the technical support to accomplish correctional education goals.
- Requirements for parent advisory committees
- Education format
- Maintenance of effort requires more uniformity, maybe go with per diem cost

A. Remediation

- Low student ratio (10-1)
- Certified teachers in the following areas:
  - Emotionally impaired
  - Mentally impaired
  - Speech and language impaired
  - Autism
- Learning disabilities program
- Related services support program
  - Curriculum specialist
  - Monitoring and compliance coordination
  - Teacher and staff training
  - Teacher consultants
  - School psychologist
- Individualization of instruction including,
  - The development of individualized goals, and objectives.

B. Impediments

- Existing federal programs requirements include applying for funds through the Department of Education (DOE). These departments in most cases, are public school oriented and do not provide the technical support to accomplish correctional education goals.
- Requirements for parent advisory committees
- Education format
- Maintenance of effort requires more uniformity, maybe go with per diem cost

C. Recommend modifications and innovations for removal of impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

1. Develop specific language, similar to Chapter I, Neglect and Delinquency, under the various federal acts for correctional education.

2. Increase the amount of federal money contained in each act.

3. Require all state departments of education to establish an office for correctional education. This office will have direct responsibility for coordinating all areas of corrections education including vocational education, special education, Adult Basic Education, General Education Diploma, driver education, consumer education, physical education, certifications, and sex education.

4. Re-examine federal and state legislation application to correctional education. For example, should special education be required, how does

(Over for continuation)

D. For the 1985 National Conference recommend major topics, program format, participants, and theme.

Topics:

1. Management of Correctional Education Programs
   - Planning and Evaluation
   - Staff evaluation and training
2. Assessment and evaluation of students
   - Planning individualized educational programs

C. Recommended modifications (continued)

the parental consent rule relates to a state ward? Can a clinical psychologist perform the task that some states require a school psychologist to perform?

C. Recommended modifications (continued)

the parental consent rule relates to a state ward? Can a clinical psychologist perform the task that some states require a school psychologist to perform?

Format:

1. Administrative sessions
2. General sessions
3. Generic content areas (reading, math, etc.)
4. Audio Visual in education (computerized education, etc.)

4. Audio Visual in education (computerized education, etc.)

Participants:

Theme:

The Greater the Risk: The Higher the Priority, We Won't Fail You

General Education Issues in Corrections

Working Session

Identify client characteristics and the general educational

A. Identify client characteristics and the general educational issues of the offender population including vocational education, adult and postsecondary education, literacy, basic education, and other issues of general concern.

- Poor survival skills
- Enrolled in 2-3 schools previously to admission
- Poor school attendance previously to admission
- Inadequate career and vocational counseling
- Poor communicative skills
- Poor social skills
- Generally abused or neglected before admission
- Little knowledge of sex gender or role
- Females - teenage parents
    - last resort for a placement alternative

(Over for continuation)

B. Identify the impediments to the provision and delivery of educational services as perceived by the Department of Education, the Corrections field, and other federal agency and professional organizational personnel.

1. The requirement to structure/organize vocational courses as determined by statewide standards.
2. Inability to adopt new courses due to resources, shortages.
3. Inability to provide certifiable skill training due to length of stay.

Special Education

1. Inadequate resources via P.L. 94-142.

A. Client Characteristics (continued)

- Unsuccessful placements in previous placements
- Poor self-esteem

General Education Issues

- Functions 2-3 years behind general age group
- Inadequate academic records, if any, provided
- Poor social skills
- Provision of consumer awareness education
- Inclusion of computer literacy training
- Legitimizing granting of credits to be used toward graduation from public schools following release
- Actual number of hours spent in the classroom

A. Client Characteristics (continued)

- Unsuccessful placements in previous placements
- Poor self-esteem

General Education Issues

- Functions 2-3 years behind general age group
- Inadequate academic records, if any, provided

- Inadequate academic records, if any, provided

- Poor social skills
- Provision of consumer awareness education
- Inclusion of computer literacy training
- Legitimizing granting of credits to be used toward graduation from public schools following release
- Actual number of hours spent in the classroom

C. Recommend modifications and innovations for removal of impediments to the delivery and provision of educational services.

1. Provide set-aside P.L. 94-142 and Vocational education funds for neglected and delinquent youth.

2. Corrections educational standards are needed

2. Corrections educational standards are needed.

3. Block grant (concept) to be applied to all available funds for corrections education.

4. Establishment of a corrections education liaison in each state department of education.

D. For the 1985 National Conference recommend major topics, program format, participants, and theme.

Topics:

- Available federal funds for corrections education - application procedures
- Adopting national standards for correction education programs
- Trends in P.L. 94-142 compliance issue
- ECIA Chapter 1 and 2 impact on correctional education
- Status of Special Net
- Literacy training
- Classroom methods and practices
- Motivating the slow learner
- Computer instruction
- Vocational training in juvenile programs

Format:

Participants:

- Adult and juvenile program representation
- Researchers - behavior disorders
                  - transition programs
                  - grant developers
- Computer instructors with a model program
- Testers - education and psychologist
- Vocational education teachers
- G.E.D. education teachers
- Reading and math education teachers
- Representatives from U.S. Department of Education
- Publishers of academic games and materials

Theme:

Educating for the Future of the Nation

Presented by: Henry L. McQueen
Institutional Services
Michigan Department of
Social Services

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses considerations administrators of correctional education must encounter in the implementation of P.L. 94-142. It also offers a position statement for an education delivery system for all students within the correctional education setting. Although this writer feels that the drafters of P.L. 94-142 did not consider the incarcerated during their rule promulgation process, the intent was to encourage state departments of education to further clarify its implementation in cooperation with correctional educators. Burrello (1981) felt that states should have had more planning/developmental time for implementing special education. Observing sequences in implementation, the additional planning time would have allowed states to examine the needs of the total population and to develop a continuum of services to meet their needs.

Almost a decade has past since the mandatory special education legislation was inacted. However, correctional programs continue to lag behind in compliance due to the late focus of the need to implement special education in correctional settings. As a result, correctional special education programs and related services should be referenced in a developmental state, rather than that of compliance. Surrent trends, however, appear to be compliance oriented rather than developmental which is largely due to P.L. 94-142 implementation timelines given to state education agencies.

correctional special education programs nationally have progressed slowly in meeting the needs of eligible handicapped children. They remain several years behind public schools in obtaining resources, i.e., related services, appropriately certified staff, placement options, as well as, receiving a range of technical assistance.

In many ways correctional special education is fighting the uphill battle that was fought by the public schools over twenty years ago. The lack of separate staff and administration has slown the battle. In order for correctional special education to have the greatest impact,a separate staff must co-exist within the education centers. The nucleous of the advocacy, required as an internal motivator, is therefore absent. As a result, administrators and staff find themselves in dual roles, teachers with a dual leader, oftentimes advocating for a program that may have greater priority than special education.

> President Ford stated "Unfortunately, the bill promises more than the federal government can deliver, and its good intentions could be thwarted by the many unwise provisions it contains."

Correctional special education programs are hampered by both of President Ford's fears. The lack of resources and provisions may be unattainable due to the many inherited restrictions of a correctional setting. The attitude of the tax payer regarding how many tax dollars should go into the correctional programs as a whole must also be considered in this dilemma.

In some states, special education rules were promulgated almost twenty years ago (Michigan P.A. 198 of 1968). Yet, the amount of resources designated for special education programs has not increased, although approximately one third (December 1, Count 1983) of the incarcerated youth are determined eligible for special education program and related services. Priorities in states continue to be security, available bed space and maintenance of facilities. These problems are compounded by the mobility of the population, location of detention centers and training schools and the task of competitive salaries within corrections as compared to the public schools. Sabatino (1981) states that the lack of qualified special education administrators may also contribute to this problem.

According to the Comptroller General Report (1981):

> "The Department (U.S. Department of Education) disagreed with GAO's recommendation to require states to document in their plans, and demonstrate to the Department's satisfaction, that they are able to carryout their responsibilities under the Act. The Department said that State plans already contain adequate assurances and that the concern raised by GAO was a compliance issue rather than a plan issue. GAO believes that, despite the assurances in existing State plans, States have problems which should be addressed in both the planning and compliance functions."

The position of the GAO can be well supported upon review of the status of correctional special education programs. Although the issue of "quality" is not at-hand, the importance of practices found in corrections is. And to assure the importance of planning leading to compliance must be rendered immediate attention.

Although, unlike Cronin (1976), I am not stressing federal takeover and operation of special education programs in corrections, but rather, a closer examination of the application of P.L. 94-142 to corrections; a set-aside grant that establishes a funding criteria separate from that of public schools (see EOA, Chapter 1, N & D Model); and, timelines that may exceed those currently mandated to allow for the student's honeymoon period to end.

It is possible,however, to implement P.L. 94-142 within correction settings. The reality, one may see, is that it may require the shifting of most of the center's resources to an individualized program based on the evaluation and needs of the student. Before this may occur, we must take in consideration the many restrictions including:

- Parents' Rights - States' Rights, related to wardship.
- Annual Foals - Relationship to rehabilitation goals.
- Least Restrictive Environment - Combining eligibility groups for treatment including special education programs and related services.
- Teacher and ancillary service provider's qualification needs- The staff team approach in a group designation setting would meet the need.

A RECOMMENDATION FOR BUILDING ACCOUNTABILITY

In many respects, use of the handicapper education process is analogous to "meeting the needs of all children" in corrections. Upon examination, it involves a knowledge of children's unique needs as they relate to their incarceration status as well as their social, emotional and academic adjustment. This is highlighted as we see special education screening, evaluation and road mapping each child's prescription for educational success.

It is time for the correctional education administrator to step back a pace or two and take stock of program's aims and examine the follow-up information relating to recidivism, re-arrest and productivity after release. In most cases, educational accomplishments will show the greatest productivity among released children. Upon observation of local program aims compare the direction of P.L. 94-142 and began to shape a prescriptive program.

As you attempt to achieve greater accountability you may condense your planning into four general categories as described by P.L. 94-142. These are:

1. Evaluation - medical, academic and psychological.
2. Identification of specific needs in the cognitive, psychomotive and affective domains.
3. Development of prescriptive plan to meet those needs identified in #2 above.
4. Evaluation -to determine achievement as well as program effectiveness.

A discussion of whom should provide programs and services was not mentioned in the above simply because the identification of specific teachers and other professionals is not needed. But observing data collected by the Nationals Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorder (March, 1981) project, University of Missouri, teachers in correctional education may require additional training in several states to meet the academic needs of their students.

To many correctional administrators, the special education process has appeared to represent a threat or a challenge to historically developed educational approaches, and a negative judgement has been made as to the efficacy of such approaches at this point and time. It is difficult to share that point-of-view. It is believed that alone with individual states standards of care, considered in licensure and accreditation, common standards of expectation must also exist for education. However it is important to see how programs are operated and whose needs they are designed to meet. In addition, there must be general recognition that whatever strenghts are inherent in our programs it is the administrator's responsibility to direct and orchestrate them or children will continue to have unmet needs.

In Michigan, there is a clear message in the data gathered over the years. Too many children come to the juvenile detention centers performing 3-5 years behind their chronological age group in reading and math. These children are ill-prepared, or disinfranchised by the system (community) placing them in the institution. Who has really failed?

A conclusive look at P.L. 94-142 reveals that common goals performance objectives, needs assessments, deliver system, evaluation and follow-up are needs within quality education programs. Only during the past nine (9) years has the education systems within the U.S. been given such a unified call-to-order process to meeting the educational needs of exceptional children.

To some, the inclusion of these specific elements in a systematic approach may appear too simple to be of value. They are not. Instead, the consideration of these components can be integrated in what may be termed a comprehensive "approach to improve education and services" for all children and youth.

With limited resources and consumers' and politicians' awareness of the pitfalls within correctional education, it is essential to start with an understanding of the inter-related needs of students in the correctional education program. These needs include, of course, the ideas and approaches which have been mentioned above, basic practices - even the physical facilities - historically involved with the provision of education in corrections programs. The task is, in a nutshell, to develop accountability and responsibility into the education system.

Only in viewing the educational needs of children at a point beginning at admission and ending upon successful placement in a continuing program after release can there be assurance of finding the organizational and operational means of achieving desired ends. P.L. 94-142 seen as an accountability model projects that instrument. This Act, identifies a continuum that plots horizontally or vertically; it may be discussed in terms of any sort of analogy - but its message is clear and can be reviewed graphically.

---

1) Referral ⟶ 2) Evaluation ⟶ 3) IEP ⟶ 4)Setting/Placement

The premise of the above construction is that:

1. The juvenile educator's primary task is meeting the needs of all children as they prepare for adulthood.

The corollary is: The needs of all children's education program to include continued and monitored progress throughout the year, and readiness and adequacy for (1) further education, employment; (2) satisfactory interpersonal relationships; and (3) good citizenship.

It may be helpful for most correctional education administrators to begin developing special education programs simply by leapfrogging from the admissions point to release planning. The question posed by such a leap in time is, "what is that a student should know and be able to do at release?" One simple response is does, the current procedures insure the readiness of the student at release? This suggest adequate planning for each child in which P.L. 94-142 will direct the total education program.

Having devised an individualized strategy for improving education programs, and recognizing that there will be change in the educational delivery systems, the remaining step is application of the strategy. The model for developing accountability into the education program has three basic areas to be covered. They are 1) the cognitive domain, dealing with communication, mathematics, natural science, social science and fine arts skills; 2) psychomotor domain, dealing with health, physical education and industrial arts skills; and 3) the affective domain, dealing with creativity, tolerance, morality, honesty, self-discipline and social awareness.

In the context of "planning for release" a continuum must be in place and should be accomplished with reference to a single student or to groups of like individuals. Therefore, application of the accountability model would be as follows:

Step A. Correctional education programs must have common goals for all students.

Step B. A determination prioritizes what children should know before being released. This information should be translated into performance objectives covering skill areas and attitude - aspirations which are in the cognitive, psycho-motor and affective domains.

Step C. After identifying the common goals of the education program and the performance objectives for the student the ability to place the student with appropriate staff becomes the third link in the continuum. Staff appropriateness "ability to meet the needs of specific children" may be among the most difficult task to complete.

Step D. To go back to Step B, "prioritizing" may be accomplished by assessing the needs of the student.

CONCLUSIONS

The position taken in this paper is that P.L. 94-142 cannot be fully implemented in correctional education programs as an individual's individualized educational program. It can however, become the stepping stone for all students in that its basic content and philosophy reflects the cradle-of-needs found in this exceptional population. Upon consideration of a "National Correctional Education Act" I would strongly recommend it as a model to copy.

There are several similarities in correctional schools day-to-day practices and the handicapper act. Among them are requirements to complete an evaluation in a timely manner; protection of student's rights; individualized education and related services; and a comprehensive testing and evaluation procedure. Because of these and others it appears that the next step would be to incorporate both general practices into one Act and to eliminate duplications.

REFERENCES

Cronin, J.M. The Federal Takeover: Should the junior partner run the firm? Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 57, 499-501.

National Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorders, Symposuim on Leadership Training Perspectives. University of Missouri - Columbia, 1981, March.

Sabatino, D.A. Are Appropriate Educational Programs Operationally Achievable Under Mandated Promises of P.L. 94-142? The Journal of Special Education. 1981, Vol. 15/No. 9-21.

State of Michigan, Department of Social Services, Institutional Services Division. Data Report, 1984.

The Comptroller General Report to the Congress of the United States. Unanswered Questions On Educating Handicapped Children in Local Public Schools. 1981, HRD-81-43.

Turnbull, A.P., Leonard, J.E. Turnbull, R. Defensible Analysis of P.L. 94-142: A Response, The Journal of Special Education Vol. 15/No. 1/1981, 25-32.

STATE DIRECTORS REPORT

Adult Corrections

Diane Spence

Michigan

State of Michigan

James Blanchard, Governor

Department of Corrections

Stevens T. Mason Building, Lansing, Michigan 48909

Perry M. Johnson, *Director*

Corrections
Commission
Gwen Andrew, Ph.D.
G. Robert Cotton, Ph.D
Thomas K. Eardley, Jr.
Don P. LeDuc
Duane L. Waters M.D.

September 21, 1984

Dr. John F. Staehle
Acting Director
Compensatory Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Room 3618
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Dr. Staehle:

I am writing to comment on two (2) of the Proposed Rules of the Federal Register/Vol. 49, No. 155/Thursday, August 9, 1984. Specifically, the Chapter I rules under Department of Education, 34 CFR Part 200, The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981.

One of my comments refers to an item on page 31919 of the Proposed Rules:

> "Section 204.21 - Annual Meeting of Parents - this section implements Section 4 of Public L. 98-211 which requires an agency that receives Chapter I funds to convene annually a public meeting to which all parents of eligible students must be invited."

It was stated on page 31920 that:

> "The Secretary is interested in receiving comments on how State agency programs, especially the program serving neglected or delinquent children, can meet this requirement."

The Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) presently has Chapter I programs in four (4) of our adult state correctional facilities. These institutions are located in three (3) separate cities in the state and they are not necessarily in representative locations where families of prisoners reside. In fact, the opposite would most probably be true. Our prisons are all located in rural areas. Most prisoners come from large cities and a few are from other states. Calling a public meeting of parents is quite impractical given the distance they would have to travel. For most of our students' parents, attending a meeting such as this would create hardships involving loss of a day or more of work as well as travel and lodging expenses. This would also be a project which would not be cost effective for MDOC Chapter I funding.

In addition, our students are young adults ranging in age from 17-20; therefore MDOC must receive their permission to contact their parents or guardians. We currently solicite input from parents via a letter/questionnaire after permission from the student is received. I believe this is the maximum involvement we can expect; we receive about a 25% response to these questionnaires.

My second comment concerns Section 204.23, Evaluation, part (2)(b)(ii) on page 31921: "A determination of whether improved performance is sustained over a period of more than one year." This determination would be difficult to impossible for most of our students for the following reasons:

(1) Because of prison overcrowding in Michigan, bed space is priority over programming. Prisoners are transferred frequently and rapidly, as soon as they are eligible for reduced custody. Therefore, there is a great deal of movement within the system. A Chapter I student may be transferred to a facility which has no Chapter I program, or any other education program.

(2) Also due to overcrowding, the Emergency Powers Act is triggered each time prison capacity level is reached and eligible prisoners receive a 90 day reduction in their sentences. Therefore, prisoners are spending less time in the system. One of our Chapter I facilities is minimum custody and average stay is four (4) months.

(3) Because our Chapter I students are at the upper levels of eligible age range (17-20), many will leave the program before enrolled a full year by virtue of reaching their 21st birthdays. Unless transferred to a new facility, they will continue their education within the same facility.

However, we are finding that because transfers occur so frequently, this will not necessarily be the case. Tracking down students at other facilities is often a time consuming and difficult task, and the same evaluation tools purchased and used by Chapter I programs may not be available at the facilities to which Chapter I students have been transferred.

Please consider these comments before finalizing the Proposed Rules. An exception to the above two sections for State Correctional Agencies should seriously be considered.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (517) 373-1838.

Sincerely,

Diane Spence
Director of Education
Michigan Department of Corrections

cc: Rudy Stahlberg, Assistant Deputy Director, MDOC
Jane Boeve, Federal Programs Coordinator, MDOC
Mike York, Consultant, Michigan Department of Education
Diane Carter, Consultant, U.S. Department of Education
Osa Coffey, Executive Director, Correctional Education Association

STATE DIRECTORS REPORT

Adult Corrections

Petrita Hernandez-Rojas
New York

GENERAL CONCERNS ON SPECIFIC PROGRAMS

I. Academic

A. Program Offerings

1. Range: ABE-GED (Non-reader--High School Equivalency)
2. Availability: ABE-GED at all program facilities with variations in staffing.

   Day and Evening Programs

   Traditional Classroom and Outreach Programs
3. Major Emphasis: English Literacy
   Spanish Literacy
   English Proficiency
   High School Credential
4. See Attachment 1 for an Overview of all Academic Education Programs
5. See Attachment 2 for a Narrative Description of the Programs

B. Success

1. Success = Enrollment

The 1983 Annual Report indicates that the ABE Program exceeded maximum enrollment.

2. Success = Literacy

The 1983 Annual Report indicates the following:

Achieving 5.0 in English	1.457
Achieving 5.0 in Spanish	213
Achieving English Fluency	433

3. Success = Credential

Data collected for FY 1983-84 but not yet published indicates:

HSE (English and Spanish combined) 2.858

Success may be measured in other ways as well, but these cannot be easily documented. The effectiveness of the program may be measured by the ultimate employability of the inmate, by the impact of the program on idleness. by comparing attendance and enrollment when not affected by other factors.

C. Inmate Participation

According to the 1983 Annual Report, a total of 11,754 inmates were enrolled in an Academic program at any one time. (Total population - 29,439)

It should be noted that the 1984 data is currently being collected and analyzed manually.

D. Federal Government Services

1. Networking of information

2. Increase funding of grants related to correctional education

   a. Pilot studies related to computer-assisted instruction
   b. Pre-Service and In-Service Training for correctional education staff
   c. Designate funds to develop, identify, replicate model correctional special education programs

II. Chapter I

A. Basic Remediation

1. Reading

2. Mathematics

3. Bilingual Education

B. Other Remedial Programs

1. Special Education

2. Speech and Hearing

3. Generic Skills

4. G.E.R.I.S. (Graphic Expression Reading Improvement System)

C. For Washington

1. The definable age for ECIA Chapter I is under 21 years old. For Neglected and Delingquent categories, we would recommend that the age be raised to 23, since a large number of new commitments fall in this age range. They have extremely low levels of achievement and are in need of remedial education.

2. Grant an increase in the per-capita allowance which hasn't been raised for several years to meet the increased cost of running education programs: higher teacher salaries, higher costs of materials, etc.

D. Program Summary

The New York Department of Correctional Services' Chapter I Program (formerly ESEA Title I) has performed well for over 10 years and has provided thousands with the needed remedial education necessary to give basic skills to inmates most in need. The successful integration with state funded programs has made the effort measurable and noteworthy. Because of consistent funding we have been able to stabilize and expand our offerings. As a result, Chapter I has become an integral part of the overall educational program of this Department.

III. Vocational

See appendix for detailed information. We need clarification and clear definition on the impact of the Vocational Education Act of 1984 on the Department of Correctional Services.

IV. Special Subjects

We need information on funding for educational programs or projects that fall in the category of Recreation, Art, Music and other leisure time type activities.

V. Libraries

NIC should provide a category for Library funding so we can have the opportunity to improve Library Resources and have a Resource Center for specialized programs such as bilingual and Special Education.

ISSUES/CONCERNS IN CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION: NATIONALLY AND IN TEXAS

A PAPER PRESENTED BY
LANE MURRAY, ED.D.
SUPERINTENDENT OF WINDHAM SCHOOL SYSTEM
AND
DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

PREPARED BY
CHERYL MOORE, PH.D.
ASSISTANT CURRICULUM DIRECTOR

OCTOBER, 1984

ISSUES/CONCERNS IN CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION

To understand the magnitude of the human loss suffered from incarceration in terms of families separated, children abandoned, incomes unearned, youths wasted, society cheated, one must be aware of a few jarring statistics. On any given day in the U.S., 625,000 persons are locked behind bars in municipal, county, state and federal prisons. Texas has the second largest adult prison population with approximately 37,000 inmates. Nationally, and in Texas as well, 95% of the prison population is male. Fourty-five percent of that population nationally is Anglo-American; 47%, Black; 6%, Hispanic; and 1%, American Indian. At least 23% of these inmates were unemployed in the month preceding their imprisonment and between 40-50% have no substantial record of employment. Osa Coffey, Executive Director of CEA, points out that, "In relation to the general population, [inmates] are disproportionately male, minority, poor, unemployed--and grossly deficient in their education." Over 75% of the prison population, 25 years of age or older, have less than a high school diploma as compared to 38% of that same age group in the "free" population. In Texas, it is estimated that over 85% of the prison population has less than a high school diploma. Nationally, 41% of the prison population has less than a 9th grade education. In Texas, the average reading level of the inmate population is 6th grade.

The relationship between incarceration and illiteracy is inescapable. Chief Justice Burger stated in his 1981 annual address to the American Bar Association, "We must accept the reality that to confine offenders behind bars without trying to change them is an expensive folly with short term benefits...." He further claimed that to improve the quality of vocational and educational programs within our prisons "is not a visionary idea but a common sense application of the concept of society's collective self-interest" since between 96-98% of the inmate population will eventually be set free. To implement Chief Justice Burger's correctional education initiative, the federal government must assume a leadership role in correctional education "philosophy, policy, [and] coordination...to reduce program fragmentation, to increase commitment, and to establish traceable paths of responsibility on the part of correctional and educational agencies at Federal, State and local levels" (Worthington letter, 1984).

A first step toward the program coordination called for by Worthington is to identify those obstacles, be they federally imposed or state initiated, that impede the provision of educational programming for incarcerated persons. The following is a brief program-by-program description or listing of many impediments presently extant that serve to thwart the correctional education effort.

Basic Academic Education

1. There exists nationally a lack of coordination between State Departments of Education and State Departments of Corrections.
2. There are often no academic or certification requirements for teachers in corrections.
3. Education programs in corrections generally compete with security and treatment functions for funds (and routinely come up short!).
4. In states where the State Department of Education oversees the corrections programs, rules and guidelines written for application in public schools are often forced to fit the penal environment.

5. In some states, no state support exists for education in corrections and only those programs that can be lawfully supported with federal assistance dollars exist. This results in supplemental programs that support nothing!
6. Minimal funds, if any, exist to provide staff development for correctional educators.
7. Fragmentation of programs is perpetuated in states where centralized support staff, be they of the Education Department or the Corrections Division, have only advisory roles rather than administrative functions.
8. Curriculum content and delivery is generally fragmented, catch-as-catch-can, providing no educational continuity for the inmate transferring even within the same system.
9. No centralized method for dissemination of information, materials, and processes among states or between states and the federal government exists.
10. The overwhelming majority of incarcerated felons are in city and county jails, where educational programming is virtually non-existent.
11. Funding limits are placed on expenditures of federal adult education dollars for incarcerated adults.

Special Education (PL 94-142)

1. Federal guidelines impose restrictions on the delivery of services in the public schools that are not always feasible or even safe when applied in prisons. The "least restrictive environment"

described in the Education of the Handicapped Act must be weighed in a prison setting against security considerations; scheduling of institution activities inclusive of feeding, recreating and sleeping; and the length of incarceration. Students incarcerated for a short time only would, for example, benefit more from intense, effective instruction in a regular classroom.

2. Parental approval requirements delay the delivery of needed services to inmates under 18.
3. The hearing process that is in place in public schools for the protection of children's rights is abused in the prison setting by inmates wishing to circumvent the institutional grievance process.

Chapter I

Due to the fact that most federal legislation appropriates funds based on the number of students below the age of 21, adult correctional facilities do not qualify for these funds since a majority of the students are above 21. The most prison prone age group nationally is 20-29 years of age. In Texas, 39% are 25 years of age or younger.

Bilingual/ESL

1. Federal guidelines stipulate age limitations that restrict the expenditure of funds to inmates under 21 and that earmark other funds specifically for institutions of higher learning.
2. Guidelines require inclusion of parents and students on advisory committees. This is, at best, impractical and, at worst, impossible to accomplish in prison.

3. State guidelines and reporting procedures require that eligible students at a given grade level be identified. This is inappropriate for adult populations that aren't grouped by grade classifications.
4. Testing devices for assessing English development levels of incarcerated adults are inadequate.
5. Funds are generally unavailable to hire teacher aides to assist with bilingual education in the correctional setting.
6. Qualified teachers are difficult to recruit. Restrictions need to be altered and/or monies made available to train qualified personnel.

Vocational Education

1. Funding by states is generally inadequate for construction or repair of vocational facilities. No federal funds are available for such purposes.
2. Space requirement regulations set by the State for vocational shops apply to public schools. Separate guidelines need to be drafted specifically for corrections.
3. Vocational programming decisions are often based on inappropriate or non-existent data relative to inmate job placement. A research based listing of vocational programs that would be appropriate in a correctional setting based on availability of prison industry jobs and "free world" job placement data is needed.
4. Required class quotas should be established for corrections rather than using guidelines created for public schools.

5. Required teacher training should be fully funded by the state or federal agency mandating the training. Some teachers are presently required to participate in training while being financially penalized for being off the job.

Post Secondary Programs

1. Indigent inmates may not be able to afford college tuition.
2. Pel Grants are limited to students who can attend 3/4 time. Most inmates have work schedules that conflict with that many hours of school. Pell Grant requirements for eligible incarcerated students should be drafted.
3. Limited course selections interfere with pursuing degree programs as needed.

Apprenticeship Related Training

1. State funding of apprenticeship training programs is unsteady and heavily swayed by political winds.
2. A federal funding source for apprenticeship programs that would be set aside specifically for corrections and would not compete with "free world" apprenticeship funding is needed.
3. Apprentices in the "free world" must receive a particular wage scale; apprentices in penal institutions should specifically be exempted.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS IN CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION

HY STEINBERG
CHIEF OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
TEXAS YOUTH COMMISSION

October 1984

ISSUES AND CONCERNS IN CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The number one issue in the United States of America is not human relations. It is not the development of human resources. It is not even the humanizing and systematic development of educational programs. The number one issue in the U.S.A. today is productivity.

By productivity, I simply mean the per man hour production of goods and services. I mean the individual's, group's, and nation's ability to produce goods and services in order to insure economic survival.

To achieve the kind of productivity needed to continue the successful growth of this country we must all work together. This includes the incarcerated since between 96 - 98% of the population in prisons will be set free in a relatively short period of time and 100% of those delinquents incarcerated in a juvenile institution will soon be back on the streets.

It will be to our benefit to insure that before the incarcerated returns to society he or she will have the potential to become a productive member of that society.

What can we do to make sure that this happens? Each of those individuals incarcerated by our justice system must be taught the necessary living, working, and learning skills identified for success. They must also be taught how to transfer those skills back to their communities. Finally, they must have the opportunity to apply those skills in a relevant and personally meaningful way.

There are impediments, however, to the achievement of this goal. These impediments exist at all levels of the system.
Many of these impediments exist within our educational programs. Some of these general impediments include:

1. The lack of coordination between the United States Department of Education, the State Department of Education, and the correctional education agencies.

2. The permissiveness of legislation which allows state departments of education not to fund correctional programs.

3. The efforts of the State Department of Education to squeeze the correctional education programs into the public school mold.

4. The fact that there is no centralized method for the dissemination of information and research findings for correctional education.

5. The open enrollment-open exit structure of the justice system requires that correctional education be totally individualized. This produces a tremendous amount of paperwork and program development activities, with not enough resources to do the job adequately.

There are also specific impediments that relate to the federal programs funded by the U. S. Department of Education. These include:

Special Education (PL 94-142)

1. Federal and state guidelines are not always feasible within the confines of a correctional education program.
2. The recruitment of qualified teaching staff is difficult due to the location of many facilities and the kind of student the teachers are asked to teach.
3. The provision of staff development is difficult due to the lack of substitute teachers in many correctional education programs.

Chapter I

Most juveniles are eligible for these funds. An inordinate amount of unnecessary paperwork exists, however, in many states which causes time to be taken away from serving the students.

Bilingual/ESL

1. The Hispanic population of the justice system is increasing dramatically, Program options and funding options have not kept pace.
2. Recruitment of qualified staff is very difficult.
3. Tests, presently available, are not adequate to accurately identify the limited English proficient student.
4. Funding resources, which are basically discretionary are not sufficient to meet correctional education needs, particularly given the increasing Hispanic population.

Vocational Education Act (PL 94.92)

1. Many juvenile corrections programs do not receive vocational education funds due to the permissiveness of the legislation.
2. Vocational programs have become dumping grounds for students who can't succeed in the academic portion of the program.

CONCLUSIONS:

The U. S. Department has set an excellent example by establishing the Office of Correctional Education within the department. The establishment of a parallel staff position for correctional education in each State Department of Education would significantly remove many of the previously mentioned impediments. Having a liaison to coordinate services and activities between correctional education, the State Department of Education, and the federal government would ensure the level of interaction needed to integrate services at all levels of the correctional education system.

Legislation needs to be drafted that ensures that correctional education programs recieve their fair share of the funds available.

Finally, we need to know what works. We cannot afford to duplicate efforts that are already being discarded somewhere else. Research and Evaluation findings must be compiled and shared so that scarse resources are not wasted. Program goals and expectations would then flow from the research thus increasing the potential for accountability and evidence to improve credibility.

HS:km 10/26/84

STATE DIRECTORS REPORT

Adult Corrections

David Carnahan

Washington

JOHN SPELLMAN
Governor

AMOS E. REED
Secretary

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Olympia, Washington 98504

November 13, 1984

Dr. Diane Carter
U. S. Department of Education
Corrections Program
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington, D. C. 20202

Dear Diane,

I want to thank you and the U. S. Department of Education for the opportunity to participate in the national forum on correctional education. As the Educational Program Administrator for the Washington State Department of Corrections, I found the experience to be most worthwhile.

In addition to the written comments I provided as a participant in the work group sessions, I would like to offer the following comments:

Correctional Education is part of the national educational system. It serves a population that has unique characteristics, while reflecting all of the general educational needs of today's society.

The recent effort by the Department of Education to exercise leadership in the area of correctional education is appreciated and essential if we are to achieve excellence in our programs. I am in full support of the mission and stated goals of the correctional education program within the Department of Education. It would seem to me that achieving these goals will do a great deal in removing the barriers to providing quality educational programs in our institutions. I would like to help the Department achieve these goals and would offer my assistance where appropriate.

There are some areas I think need specific attention and they include:

a. Continue to help develop the state's correctional education leadership by working more directly with the state correctional education program administrators.

b. Collect and publish statistics on the national correctional education system that would serve the needs of policy makers and practitioners.

c. Continue the coordination within the U. S. Department of Education that will provide equitable access to resources. This might best be accomplished by forming an ad hoc committee of state program administrators to work directly with the U. S. Department of Education staff in the development of proposed legislation and regulations.

d. Provide leadership in the development of a national public policy for correctional education.

e. Help develop programs that will facilitate the offender's transition from correctional education to public education.

I would concur with the review conducted by the corrections program staff regarding the legislation regulation and guidelines under the Department of Education's jurisdiction which are problematical to the funding and administration of correctional education programs at the state and local level (attached).

The one exception would be with regard to PL89-329 Higher Education. Since our state is funding the full cost of the inmate education programs, our students and/or the state are not eligible to participate in this program.

In addition, PL92-318 Indian Education recognizes the unique needs of native American students but there is no way we know of that this resource can be used to serve the 263 native Americans we hold in our state adult correctional institutions.

I hope you find these comments to be helpful and again, I want to thank you for the opportunity to participate in the national forum and to express my concerns as we work towards improving our programs.

Sincerely,

David J. Carnahan
Educational Administrator

DJC/lr

Attachment

State Directors Meeting

The Corrections Program began as a cooperative effort between the Department of Education and the National Institute of Corrections, with a great deal of encouragement from the Correctional Education Association. One of the primary objectives was to facilitate linkages between correctional agencies and the federal government as well as among state agencies in order to establish good channels for communications and information flow.

A very important task toward reaching this goal is the Annual Meeting of State Directors of Correctional Education convened and conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, and held in conjunction with the Correctional Education Association's Annual Conference.

There has been tremendous progress towards accomplishing this goal in the three years since the 1st State Directors Meeting held in Baltimore in 1982. At that meeting 20 State Directors were present; there were 25 State Directors at the Houston meeting in 1983; and, at this year's meeting in Philadelphia we had 32 State Directors. We hope to have all 90 State Directors at our Atlanta meeting in 1985.

The overall purpose of these meetings is to provide an opportunity for State Directors of Correctional Education to have input into the Correctional Program, and to receive up-to-date information, share concerns, and create better linkages for mutual support and knowledge transfer -- especially at this time of crisis when ever increasing prison populations are coupled with dwindling resources.

State Directors of Correctional Education are key in developing a comprehensive, integrated, holistic approach to correctional education. The participants at these meetings have provided the Department with specific concerns of the states on the needs and problems of correctional education and suggested ways the Department might be able to address them.

The State Directors identified two common concerns, administrative and funding for correctional education delivery. These concerns as expressed were:

1. There is organizational fragmentation of correctional education at the state levels. The links to public education are often absent or inadequate, and there is little or no coordination among related agencies and services.

2. There is inadequate support for correctional education from correctional and education administrations, and as a consequence correctional education usually does not receive adequate funding, representation, or appropriate space.

3. There was no National Policy on correctional education due to the differences among states in organizational structure, policies, and laws.

The factors contributing to these problems were identified as: the lack of a clear cut legal mandate for correctional education; the lack of a coordinated effort and federal leadership, until ED established the Corrections Program, to encourage the cooperation of local, state and federal agencies to develop and deliver educational services to the incarcerated.

The participants suggested that the most important work of the Intra-Departmental Coordinating Committee on Correctional Education would be to continue to coordinate policy, funding, and services among the programs in the Department which impact on correctional education, and to serve as a model and encourage the State Departments of Education to do the same.

Needed Changes in Legislation, Rules, Regulations

At the request of Secretary Bell, the Corrections Program reviewed the legislation, regulations and guidelines under the Department of Education's jurisdiction which are problematical to the funding and administration of correctional education programs at the state and local levels.

In order to do a more thorough review, we sought assistance from the State Department of Corrections and the State Directors of Correctional Education in identifying the specific Federal education legislation, regulations and guidelines which were considered to be particular problems for the correctional education field. This study was undertaken in 1981 and is in need of updating now. The programs identified for the review were:

o P.L. 95-561	Title I, ESEA (now Chapter I)
o P.L. 94-142	Education of Handicapped Children
o P.L. 94-182	Vocational Education Act
o P.L. 91-230	Adult Education Act
o P.L. 89-329	Higher Education Act
o P.L. 95-123	Library Services and Construction Act

The overriding concerns from the states were that corrections be given equitable participation in these acts; that federal education legislation specifically include a statement that requires state departments of education to address the needs of students in the correctional settings; and that specific set-asides or allocation formulas be written into the legislation, regulations and guidelines outlining how federal funds can be used, so that educational services mandated by Congress will reach correctional student populations.

Correctional institutions are generally eligible to receive financial support for their educational programs under permissive legislation whose language includes offenders in the broad target population of disadvantaged. But many correctional agencies do not receive these resources - some are unaware that these resources exist; others are unwilling or unable to pull together and plow through the various pieces of educational legislation, rules and regulations, combine this information into a coherent package, write a proposal, and submit an application having no assurances that it will be funded. Educational agencies are themselves over extended and strained in their efforts to work out an equitable distribution of their very limited funds among the many eligible target groups in our free society. Thus, in many instances, they do not reach out to the correctional students.

Summary of major concerns:

P.L. 95-561, Title I. Legislation and guidelines generally follow the schedule and needs of local educational agencies without taking into consideration the unique circumstances existing in correctional institutions. This severely restricts the participation of many correctional students, and causes an inordinate amount of unnecessary paperwork and unproductive time for educational and correctional personnel.

P.L. 94-142. More problems were delineated by correctional agencies in terms of the administration of P.L. 94-142 than were identified in any other piece of legislation. Written mainly for public schools, it is almost impossible to apply to a correctional institution. Inadequate funding is a major obstacle in implementing this law. This act requires relationships and responsibilities which are not only inappropriate, even impossible for correctional agencies to carry out.

P.L. 94-482, Vocational Education. Many states have not involved their correctional agencies with financial support from this Act based on various interpretations of the distribution of funds criteria. These criteria are used by many State Boards to exclude correctional agencies from total involvement in the subparts and provisions of the Act.

P.L. 95-581, Adult Education. Incarcerated adults are lumped into the broad category of institutionalized adults and are funded at the discretion of state departments of education.

P.L. 89-329, Higher Education. Pell grants have proved to be an excellent source of support for incarcerated students pursuing post-secondary education.

P.L. 123, Library Services. Funds for institutionalized persons reach correctional education through a set-aside determined by the State Educational Agency. The level of the set-aside varies from state to state.

Conclusions:

Correctional agencies and institutions have experienced many problems in utilizing federal resources due to the language of the various pieces of legislation, guidelines, and regulations which, on the whole, seem to be drafted exclusively for students in free society and traditional school settings. A greater sensitivity to the acute needs of offenders and the unique conditions of confinement in the writing of legislations, guidelines, and regulations would contribute greatly to upgrading and expanding correctional education and increasing the successful reintegration of offenders into society and the labor market.

STATE DIRECTORS REPORT

Outline of Concern Areas
Juvenile Corrections

Alfred Lynch

Washington

Issues: Vocational Education

Special Education

Post-testing ~~from~~ for89-750 students

Transition - inter/intra institutional and other agencies

Bi-lingual/bi-cultural correctional education

Pre and In service staff training

Normed assessments for correctional populations done on similar pop.

STATE DIRECTORS REPORT

Adult and Juvenile Corrections

Dr. Robert Hable

Wisconsin

There are a number of issues that must be resolved in order to build real working relationships between Corrections Education and the state and national education network. All of us in the field of Corrections Education appreciate the efforts of the U.S. Department of Education in establishing the Corrections program in the Department and in hosting this National Correctional Education Forum.

At the outset of any discussion on Corrections education, one essential fact must be recognized. In contrast to all other types of education programs in our country, only Corrections education has no political constituency. Public discussion focuses on putting more people behind walls, but not on providing more resources to help the incarcerated return as productive citizens. Thus, when the Department of Education develops guidelines for funding resources for education programs that permit rather than mandate service for the incarcerated, state educational agencies can choose to provide funds or not. The lack of political constituency becomes significant in the decision-making process. Here in Wisconsin, we have established good rapport with the state agencies that allocate funds, and we have done quite well in obtaining resources, but the whole system is based on permissive regulations. We need more mandated services for correctional clients.

In Wisconsin, we receive substantial funds through the entitlement programs in Chapter I and Special Education; also we receive substantial funds from the Federal Vocational Education Act based on long-standing cooperation with the State Vocational System. However, we get very little from Chapter II or the Adult Basic Education Act and other permissive funding sources because we have not yet built the necessary liaison to get results. Obviously, we would prefer more specific mandatory guidelines in using federal funds for Correctional Education.

The second part of the issue with regulations and guidelines is that they are written for community schools, not correctional institutions. Because the guidelines do not recognize the unique structure of correctional education, we have difficulty in making them fit, and often we run head long into disputes with the very agencies we are trying to cultivate to permit special funding. All schools have had some problems with PL-94-142, but none of the dimension with Corrections Schools. In my first reading of 78 pages of regulations on PL-94-142, I identified 37 pages that did not apply to Corrections. Unfortunately, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction did not agree, and we are still debating rules when we should be serving students. At our corrections education conferences, we complain about the community school/corrections school problem, but until now, with the establishment of Coordinating Committee on Correctional Education in the Department of Education, we have had little chance of influencing regulations. We will seize our opportunity in working with the Department in drafting guidelines for funding.

With mandated service and guidelines written for correctional institutions, we will take a great stride forward in providing service to our clients.

Internally, one of the issues facing correctional education is the extent of services for our students. Our students have a wide variety of needs, and we have limited resources for filling those needs. In fact, we try to do too many things, and often end up doing many of them inadequately. In Wisconsin, we intend to focus our efforts on literacy and employability. By concentrating on these two areas, we will use our scarce resources in helping our clients to develop skills that will help them in free society. We believe we can do these things well within the confines of security and the time frame for our inmates. We want the Department of Education to help us with resources in developing this program for inmates in Wisconsin Correctional institutions. The needs list is long. We need expertise, advice, equipment, staff development, and research, and above all, we need help in findng the appropriate section of the Department that can help us. With a small staff and limited resources, it is beyond our capacity to make all the contacts necessary, so we are relying on the Corrections Program in the Department to help us. It is vital that the Corrections Program expand its services to us so we can expand our services to our students.

REH:bw
10-24-19/206

"END OF DOCUMENT"